AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

NEW SERIES—VOL. IV.—(XIV.)—MARCH, 1896.—NO. 3.

MATINS AND LAUDS.

(STUDIES IN THE BREVIARY.)

IN a paper I had the privilege lately of writing for the AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW,[1] I mentioned that the Divine Office should be studied in connection with the Mass. In this paper I propose briefly to consider how this may be done; and for practical purposes I shall divide the Office into three parts—the Night Office, the Day Office and the Evening incense of prayer.

The Night Office, or matins and lauds, are full of thoughts of the Mass and of the Victim we are about to offer. They are a most valuable preparation for the Sacrifice; and are considered so by Holy Church, who lays it upon her priests an obligation[2] that they should have said at least these parts of the Office before celebrating: *Saltem Matutino cum Laudibus absoluto.* If the Psalms are full of Our Lord and show us *the mind that is in Jesus*, what better means could there be of filling our hearts, too, with the same mind than the recital of these Psalms? For, as we share in Our Lord's Priesthood, we have to share in its fullness. He was not only the Offerer, but also the Victim; and we, too, are called

1 September, 1895.

2 I do not here consider the extent of the obligation, that I leave to the moral theologians. That there *is* an obligation is sufficiently clear from the fact that the Church legislates about it.

upon to make a pleasing sacrifice of ourselves in union with Him. Since, then, the Psalms of Matins and Lauds help us to penetrate our souls with Our Lord's own disposition, what better preparation for Mass can we have than the Matins and Lauds said *attente et devote?*

We will briefly run through Matins and Lauds, say, of a confessor-pontiff, and just glance at the help this particular office gives us in attuning our heart for celebrating Mass. After the introductory prayer *Aperi Domine os meum*, which puts us at once both at the disposal of Our Lord and unites us with Him, we are met in the first prayer of the Office, the *Pater Noster*, with that beautiful reference to the Blessed Sacrament, *Panem nostrum quotidianum da nobis hodie*, and the thought of the gracious answer to that prayer which awaits us as the moment of Communion fills our soul with a great longing for the Bread to be given us this day. Then, we who are to do Mary's work ask her help, and we make a profession of faith before we approach the great Mystery of faith. Again, what can better recall to us the Mass than the Sign of the Cross we make on our mouth, which is so soon to receive the Food of Life: *Lord, open Thou my lips* which will have to speak the awful Words of Consecration; *and my mouth shall show forth Thy praise*, even the Eucharist, which is Thy highest praise and which shall bless my mouth with Its presence. The thought of the tremendous Sacrifice fills us with dread; and we implore God's assistance. Our confidence is in His name and we throw ourselves upon His omnipotence which made Heaven and Earth.

The Invitatory then comes to mark more clearly the connection between our Mass and Office. *The King of Confessors, the Lord* whom we are going to offer in sacrifice to the Eternal Father, *oh, come let us adore.* The whole of the Psalm is one of encouragement to us to prepare well for the Sacrifice. It fills us with reverence and awe; for it is to *God the great Lord and the mighty King over all Gods* that we are going to sacrifice. He will not refuse to accept our offering: *for the Lord will not repel His people.* He is our Maker, the maker of the sea and of the dry land; but He is

also *the Lord our God; we are His people and the sheep of His pasture*, therefore we need not fear *to come and adore and fall down* in worship before the Lord and to weep before Him for the sins of the world. To-day we shall hear His voice speaking by our lips. *This is my Body;* we must not harden our hearts against His coming, for we are not like the fathers in the desert who saw only the manna; we see the real Bread of Heaven, the great work of His omnipotence and love. Then, He is nigher to us than ever He was to our forefathers. How much more terrible will be our punishment if we know not His ways? And so on throughout this wonderful Psalm of preparation for the Great Mystery.

The hymn *Iste confessor* puts us under the patronage of the saint whose feast we keep and in honor of whom we are going to offer Mass. To be worthy of our high office we, too, ought to be *pious*, *prudent;* for those who have to deal with the Lord must be wary lest they abuse His infinite Holiness. For as an old English anchoress says:

"Our courteous Lord willeth we be as homely with Him as heart may think or soul may desire. But be we ware that we take not so recklessly this homely heed for to leave courtesy; for our Lord Himself is sovereign homelihood, and so homely as He is, as courteous He is; for He is very courteous."[1]

Humble, too, must we be, and *chaste* and *sober* in our use of bodily pleasures, for we are victims dying daily in the ...ce and having here below no abiding city.

W... can do no more than just indicate in certain verses the line to be taken with the Psalms that are written of, or in the person of the Victim we are going to offer. Most of the thoughts are from the Fathers.

1. Psalm, *Beatus vir:* Concerning the coming Christ, the Tree of Life.

2. *Sed in lege Domini voluntas ejus et in lege ejus meditabitur die ac nocte:* The law of God is the law of sacrifice;

1 Mother Julian, a Benedictine anchoress, at Norwich (1343–1443). Her "Revelations of Divine Love" are exquisite reading and full of deep and tender thoughts.

and our thoughts ought ever to be fixed upon our Mass. Our first thought in the morning, our most joyful remembrance in the day, and our last at night.

3. *Et erit tamquam lignum quod plantatum est secus decursus aquarum:* The Blessed Man—Jesus—is planted on the tree of the cross—the altar of sacrifice—beside the torrent of grace which comes from that sacrifice.

II. Psalm, *Quare fremuerunt gentes:* Concerning Christ, His Passion and Power.

2. *Adversus Dominum et adversus Christum ejus:* The world strives against the God to whom we are going to sacrifice, and against the anointed Priest and Victim.

6. *Ego autem constitutus sum Rex ab eo super Sion montem sanctum ejus:* Christ's Priesthood, in which we share, is a royal one. In and by Him we are kings and rule at the altar.[1]

7. *Dominus dixit ad me: Filius meus es tu, ego hodie genui te:* Compare this with the *Tu es sacerdos in aeternum* of the Mass. God says this also to each one of us *hodie:* our vocation to the Eternal Priesthood.

8. . . . *dabo tibi gentes haereditatem tuam* . . . The Mass is the world's sacrifice, and is offered for the whole heritage of God.

10. *Et nunc reges intelligite:* Now the High Priest, the King, speaks to us who share in his regal priesthood.

11. . . . *Et exultate ei cum tremore:* Rejoice because of our dignity; but tremble lest we come short of it.

III. *Domine quid multiplicati:* Concerning Christ in His passion.

3. *Tu autem Domine susceptor meus es gloria mea et exaltans caput meum:* The Father has now taken to Himself a priest after His own heart; and this is the glory of our vocation: that we are priests to our God. The Father was the lifter-up of the Son in two ways. By the lifting-up on

1 Mystical writers always consider Sion as meaning the Church Militant, while Jerusalem signifies Heaven. We can take Sion here as meaning the Church's altar, which as the Holy Hill is lifted up in sight of God and men.

the Cross, and by exalting Him in glory. In this we also share.

4. *De monte sancto suo:* That holy Hill, the altar, to which we pray God at the beginning of Mass to send forth His light so as to lead and bring us.

5. *Ego dormivi . . . et exurrexi:* This, spoken of the sleep of death and of the Resurrection, may be taken of the mystical sleep of the Eucharist and Our Lord's life within us after Holy Communion.

7. . . . *Dentes peccatorum contrivisti:* The sacred Food breaks the teeth of the ungodly in the sense of St. Thomas's *Mors est malis, vita bonis.*

In the lessons of the First Nocturn we get either extracts from the Epistle we are to read in the Mass; or in the responsaries many of the versicles come again to us in the *Gradualè.* These show us Christ, the eternal High Priest; and lead us to think of ourselves as sharing in His Office.

IV. Psalm, *Cum invocarem:* Concerning Christ after His passion glorified by the Father.

1. *Cum invocarem exaudivit me Deus justitiæ meæ:* Our prayer in the Mass is always heard. The God of our righteousness cannot turn a deaf ear to the Victim we offer.

2. . . . *Orationem meam:* The prayer of prayers—the Mass—the prayer of Jesus, Who is always heard on account of His reverence.

34. *Mirificavit sanctum suum:* God has made His Holy One, Christ, to be wonderful in the eyes of the world, and in no way more wonderful than in His priesthood, which is eternal, and in this mystery of mysteries, the Mass.

6. *Sacrificate sacrificium justitiæ . . . Quis ostendit nobis bona:* The sacrifice of Him who is our righteousness, and our means of paying our debts to the Most High. The world has no good thing of its own that can be offered as worthy of God's acceptance.

7. *Signatum est super nos lumen vultus tui Domine: dedisti lætitiam in corde meo:* The priestly character imprinted in our souls is the light of God's face turned in a mercy towards

us; and in that light we see the light of His love and our heart is filled with joy.

8. *A fructu frumenti, vini et olei sui:* The Bread and the Wine of sacrifice and the holy Unction of ordination which multiplies priests in the Church.

V. Psalm, *Verba mea:* Concerning Christ, the habitation of Saints.

1. . . . *clamorem meum:* The strong cry that went up from the Cross.

3. . . . *Mane exaudies vocem meam:* The Morning Sacrifice is heard because it is most pleasing to the All-Holy.

4. *Mane astabo tibi:* At the hour of the Morning Sacrifice we stand before God; and we see His spotless sanctity which cannot abide sin.

8. *Introibo in domum tuam: adorabo ad templum sanctum tuum*, etc.: Compare with the *Introibo ad altare Dei.*

15. . . . *Ut scuto bonæ voluntatis . . . coronasti nos:* Our vocation, which is our crown, is not the result of our own will, but of the will of Him who says: *You have not chosen Me, but I have chosen you.*

VIII. Psalm, *Domine dominus noster:* Concerning Christ in the glory of His priesthood.

1. . . . *Quam admirabile est nomen tuum in universa terra:* By the sacrifice which is offered to His name from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same.

2. *Magnificentia tua:* Nothing shows the glory of God so well as the Eucharistic sacrifice wherein one divine person pays homage in his human nature to the eternal Godhead.

5. *Quid est homo, etc.:* What is man that Thou shouldst take him up from the dunghill of his misery and put him among the princes of Thy people by associating him with Thyself in Thy own royal priesthood?

6. *Gloria et honore coronasti eum:* A little lower than the angels by nature, by ordination we are crowned with the eternal glory and honor of our Office which is far above that of angels.

7. *Omnia subjecisti sub pedibus ejus:* In giving us power over Himself, God has put all things under our feet.

The lessons of the Second Nocturn give us the example of a saint who used his priesthood to form himself upon the model of the eternal High Priest. All his sanctity came from his vocation; and we are reminded of the abundant means the priesthood affords for growing in holiness. The responsaries, which we find also in the Mass, are comments upon what we have read.

Oleo sancto meo unxi eum: the annointing at ordination; *Manus mea auxiliabitur ei;* the imposition of hands which gives us the Holy Ghost. *Electum:* the chosen one; *ipse intercedat pro peccatis omnium populorum:* the very work of a priest to offer sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead.

VII. Psalm *Domine quis habitabit:* Concerning Christ, the example of His saints.

1. *Quis habitabit in tabernaculo tuo aut quis requiescet in monte sancto tuo?* Am I worthy to be in the House of God, or to stand before His holy altar?

2. *Sine macula:* Purity of heart is required of him who would offer the sacrifice.

3. *Veritatem in corde suo:* Truth teaches us the humility so necessary if we would perform our priestly duty well.

6. *Munera super innocentem non accepit:* We accept a gift against the innocent one when we take pleasure in what offends Him. Compare at the Mass: *In quorum manibus inquitates sunt: dextera eorum repleta est muneribus.*

VIII. Psalm, *Domine in virtute tua:* Concerning Christ the King and His inheritance.

1. *In virtute tua:* The priestly power is from God.

Desiderium cordis ejus: This reminds us of our longing and the fervor of our early days.

3. *In benedictionibus dulcedinis:* In a faithful priest his Mass is the one fount of sweetness which is never exhausted and which grows sweeter day by day.

Coronam de lapide pretioso: a crown of glory made up of that Precious Stone, the Blessed Sacrament, that White Stone given in the Apocalypse (Chapter 2-17) to him that overcomes.

6. *Benedictionem in saeculum saeculi:* The priesthood the source of all the blessings is eternal.

IX. Psalm, *Domini est terra:* Concerning Christ and His priest.

3. *Quis ascendet in montem Domini:* Again the going up to God's altar.

4. *Innocens manibus et mundo corde:* Compare the *Lavabo inter innocentes manus meas*, and the *munda cor meum.*

6. *Hæc est generatio quærentium eum:* Priests, above all, must seek the Face of the Lord; for their Office calls them to stand before Him day by day.

7. *Attollite portas, etc.:* A call to us to open our heart to Him who comes in Communion—the Lord of Hosts, the King of Kings.

The lessons of the Third Nocturn are always on the Gospel we shall read in the Mass. They prepare us to take to heart the Words of the Lord upon our vocation. In the *Te Deum* we find much to remind us of our Mass and the disposition in which we should celebrate. The *triple Sanctus* at once reminds us of that glorious hymn of adoration which we sing, "together with the angels," just before we enter within the Sacred Veil of Silence that enshrouds the Canon. Again, if it is such marvel that our Lord did not abhor the Virgin's womb, when she was all pure, is it not a greater marvel that He does not shrink from putting Himself into the power of sinful weak men like those He has chosen to be His priests? *Die ista:* This day, the day of our sacrifice —should be free from sin. Sin upon any day is an evil too terrible to think of, but how inexpressibly awful in being committed while the rays of the brightness of the Sacrifice are still on our soul.

LAUDS.

I. Psalm, *Dominus regnavit:* Concerning Christ who is to be our Guest.

1. *Indutus est Dominus fortitudinem et praecinxit se:* We

must manfully set about preparing ourselves and gird up our loins for the Guest we are awaiting. He is the God strong and mighty; and we must be strong and mighty in His place to receive Him worthily.

3. *Parata sedes tua ex tunc:* The preparation of our heart ought to have been completed from the day of our ordination (*tunc*)—Alas, our fervor has decreased!

5. *Elevaverunt flumina fluctus suos:* The waves of love and of hope and of faith ought now to be welling up in our heart.

7. *Domum tuam decet sanctitudo:* Our heart must be sanctified, for it is the Home of the Lord, wherein He delights to dwell.

II. Psalm, *Jubilate Deo:* Concerning Christ our joy.

1. *Servite Domino in lætitia:* The sacrifice of the man is *sonus tanquam epulantis.* Compare: *Qui laetificat juventutem meam.*

2. *Introite in conspectu ejus in exultatione:* Ezechiel says: *They shall enter into My Sanctuary and they shall come near to My Table* (44, 16).

4. *Oves pascuæ ejus:* The love of the Good Shepherd is here unfolded. *He hath set me in a place of pasture. Thou hast prepared a table for me . . . and Thy Cup . . . how goodly it is!* (Ps. 21).

5. *Quoniam suavis:* Three reasons for joy at our approaching sacrifice. The Victim is so sweet, so merciful, and so true.

III. Psalm, *Deus Deus meus* and *Deus misereatur:* Concerning Christ our Food and Refuge.

1. *Ad te de luce vigilo:* Our Mass ought to be our first and earliest thought. We look forward to it from our first awaking.

6. *Sicut adipe et pinguedine repleatur anima mea:* The Blessed Sacrament is the fatness of wheat and royal dainties.

8. *Me suscepit dextera tua:* We are the instruments in the hands of the High Priest, by which he worships his Father.

2. *In terra viam tuam:* The way of the altar, that is the life of sacrifice.

6. *Terra dedit fructum suum:* The fruit of the earth is the Blessed Sacrament, the fruit of the Tree of Life.

Benedicite: Concerning Christ the First-born of every creature.

In this Canticle we call upon all creation to bless God for having called us to be His priests, and for having given to us such great power. The Eucharistic Sacrifice is offered in the name of all creation; and all the works of God's hands, therefore, enter into and take part in our great act of worship. Therefore they ought all to join with us in returning thanks, blessing and praising Him for having given such power to men.

V. Psalms, *Laudate*, *Cantate*, *Laudate:* Concerning Christ the Head of the Mystical Body.

In the first Psalm we have the voice of the Church Militant, praising God for the "Precept" of sacrificing. We are the sons of Israel. We are the people that are nigh Him, for we share in His own ineffable Priesthood.

The second Psalm is the voice of the Church Suffering. The "new song" is the Mass which brings daily a new relief to the Holy Souls, therefore they say His Land, the land of Purgatory, is the assembly of Holy ones, *i. e.*, made holy by the power of the Sacrifice. They think of and praise His mercy in choosing men to be His priests, exalting the meek into the worker of the miracle of consecration, and giving them the power of the keys whereby they can bind "the strong in bonds" and "in iron chains the mighty," or loosen them on earth or help them in purgatory.

In the third Psalm we get the voice of the Church Triumphant. For the Mass sends a thrill of joy among all the saints and they assist at it in wondering rapt adoration. For is it not said *cum angelis at archangelis cumque omni militia coelestis exercitus?*

All creation thus is called upon by our Lord through our means, acting as His mouthpiece, to enter into the Eucharistic Sacrifice and share in His worship of the Eternal Father.

The Little Chapter is from the Epistle. In the Hymn our

thoughts turn to the great High Priest Himself, and to His servant we honor on his feast day. The *Benedictus* is full of teaching about the Sacrifice we are going to offer. By it we prepare the Way of the Lord for His coming into the hearts of His children. By it we give the knowledge of salvation to them for the remission of sins. By it we show them the mercy of God and give light to those in darkness and set their feet in the way of peace. Thus the priest's whole duty, his whole life is summed up in one word: The Mass.

The Prayer is the same one we shall use later on as the Collect at Mass; and in it we ask that the ends of the Sacrifice may be granted. We refer again to the Mass in the words: *Per Dominum nostrum*, for He is the Victim on account of whose reverence we are heard.

As a last preparation we turn to our Lady in the anthem proper for the season, and put ourselves under her keeping. As she brought forth her Divine Son in Bethlehem, so are we going to do a like work, and bring Him forth in the new Bethlehem—the House of Bread—and lay Him upon the Manger of the Altar; and give Him to the adoration of the Sacrifice, wrapped in the swaddling clothes of the sacred species. Meet then is it that we should seek her aid and offer our Sacrifice through her most pure hands and add thus to its acceptance.

ETHELRED L. TAUNTON.

London, England.

THE EDUCATION OF OUR CLERICAL STUDENTS.

First Article.

THE importance of a sound clerical education cannot be overrated. The clergy are the leaders of men.

From the oak-crowned Druid of the idolatrous forest tribes to the painted Medicine Man of the Spirit-awed savages, from the stolid Bonze of the Buddhist to the cymbaling Salvation Army lass, from the "called" preacher of Christian sects to the money-getting lecturer on Agnosticism, from the Levite-born priest of the Old Law to the priest elected of God in the New, all ministers of religion, whether true or false, necessarily exercise a powerful influence over their co-religionists, little affected by the blatant declamations against so-called priest-ridden communities and minister-worship.

Religion, worship of God, how unknown soever He may be, is still the ruling passion of man. It is still the great concern of life, if not during the short span of its care-worn days, then at least at the supreme moment of its sudden ending. Hence the man who consecrates his life to minister to the spiritual needs of his fellow-creatures is sure to dominate and fashion to a greater or less extent the inner life and outward actions, not only of the individual but of the community in which he lives.

If this is true in general, it is especially so with regard to the One Church of God, whose priesthood rely not on their personal ability and knowledge but on the grace and power of God, committed to them as dispensers for the sanctification of souls.

It is, therefore, not to be wondered at that, from the very beginning of Christianity, the Church has laid especial stress upon the fitness of her priests for the great work to which they are elected. Indeed, Christ Himself emphasized the sublimity of the priestly office and required every Christian virtue of the Apostles and Disciples who went to preach in His name. No Bishop of the Church could be more exacting in his demands as to the qualifications of candidates for Holy Orders than was St. Paul towards those upon whom he

imposed hands. If amid the growth of material prosperity the clergy has at times lost sight of the ideals which must ever inspire those who enter its ranks, the Church always recalled them to a sense of their duties by exhortation, legislation, and if necessary by penalties.

For a thousand years the Church, faithful to a policy which had been inaugurated by the Apostles wherever practicable,[1] induced the faithful of each congregation or diocese to select their pastors and clerics from amidst their own ranks. It has been the custom of Popes and Bishops at all times to foster the formation of a native clergy as soon as possible ; and it is the approved policy of the Bishops of the United States to-day. True, in the building up of new Congregations or Dioceses the ideal missionary priest is the one who, like Melchisedec, knows not father or mother, brother or sister, or any one who can claim relationship. The very fact of his being free from all entanglements of nationality, sectionalism or clan gives him, in a mixed community, an influence, as a rule, beyond the suspicion of partiality. Nevertheless it is desirable, when communities become homogeneous and when ecclesiastical matters can be regulated in conformity with Canon Law, that we should have priests racy of the soil. The Catholic people resident for any length of time in the States are more attracted to them, more apt to accept their arguments and admonitions. Native priests find it on the whole easier to disarm the prejudices of their non-Catholic fellow-citizens. The broad relationship and national sympathy which exist between the priest and the larger portion of the Church not only prevents frictions arising from a lack of such sympathy, but it also becomes an incentive to work for the young priest, who realizes that, whilst he is subject to the criticism of those who are not in harmony with the local methods, he will be supported by that more numerous class of the faithful who understand and feel with him.

1 Witness the warning of St. Paul (I Tim., iii, 6), not to admit a neophite to the Episcopal office.

However, like all good things, this state of affairs has its drawbacks, and must in the course of time breed abuses. Centuries of forbearance will harden customs into law, and make evils appear necessities.

After the Apostolic times, young men aspiring to the priesthood were attached to the churches of their native cities in various capacities. Love for the Church and its ministers, many of whom were their blood relations, prompted people of means to endow the house of God with permanent incomes. As generation after generation passed away, pious people established permanent benefices for the clergy, and it was but natural and perfectly legitimate that their own relatives or friends should become the preferred beneficiaries of their generosity. And thus, in the long run, it came to pass that the selection of that privileged clergy was dictated more by affection and interest than by learning and vocation. Less strictly held to accountability by the pastor—often a relative or one beholden to the parents of the candidates for promotion—these paid less attention to the requirements of science and virtue than to the claims of gratitude or patronage. The young clerics thus became more anxious to get a benefice than to become good priests, hence less learned and pious. The example of this worldliness became in turn the pattern of life for the younger aspirants to the Holy Orders who were mostly educated in or near the parochial houses, and thus became witnesses to the disorders of the elder clergy. Hence the gradual lowering of the high standard of priestly life. At the end of the Middle Ages the priesthood had in many parts become more an official position of honor than a dreaded responsibility for the salvation of souls.

Alarmed at such a state of affairs which, now that the so-called Reformation had reared its restless head and turned its tentacles on the plague spots of the human side of the Church, became a real danger to the faith of the nations, the Popes determined to apply an effective remedy. A general Council was called, which would reform without destroying. The Council of Trent stands to this day, not only for absolute purity of doctrine, but for perfection of discipline as well.

In its XXIII Session held July 15th, 1563, the Fathers decreed[1] that special colleges be established for the education of youths destined for the ministry of the altar. Thus young clerics were to be removed from the influence of a worldly and ambitious clergy and given an opportunity to prepare themselves worthily for the reception of the Sacrament of Holy Orders. Here we have the origin of the permanent establishment of Catholic Colleges for clerics: "Into this college shall be received such as are at least twelve years of age, born in lawful wedlock, and who know how to read and write competently, and whose character and inclination afford a hope that they will always serve in the ecclesiastical ministry." [2]

Ere we pass to a consideration of the character of these colleges, let us briefly inquire to whom belongs in the first instance the responsibility of watching over the vocation of boys destined for the priesthood before they have reached the age required for entrance into the seminary, or, as the Council puts it, before they are twelve years old. A further question is how that duty is to be performed.

It is a truth which has passed into a Catholic axiom that the duty as well as the right of early education belongs to the parents of the child. However, the child must be instructed; and most parents have neither the time nor inclination, even if they had the means and ability, to give instruction to their children. Hence the necessity of the school, so that these young boys "may know how to read and write competently," as the Council of Trent directs. The forming of the mind and heart, the fashioning of the character and will of the child thus passes into the hands of school teachers; and who does not know how deep and abiding is the influence of the teachers of our early years upon our own future lives. The awakening, the growth and blossoming of the ecclesiastical vocation are thus left to the influence of the school, of its officers and of its teachers. Hence, the necessity of the Catholic school for the right and perfect development

1 Sess. XXIII, cap. 18. 2 Conc. Trid. loc. cit.

of ecclesiastical vocations. Indeed the Catholic school plays a much more important factor in the education of our clergy than the Catholic college ; for the fostering or undoing of a vocation lies within the power of the teachers of early youth. Thence follows the direct responsibility of the parish priest in the matter of ecclesiastical vocation. To a priest who defended the neutral system of public instruction, by saying that he had been to a school " where there was neither cross nor holy picture, and he did not see the necessity of the Catholic school," a bishop made the pertinent answer : " Sir, that accounts for your opinions in the matter of education." The dearth of priests in France at the beginning of this century, and in Germany at the present day, supplies the historical proof, if any were needed for what we have just said ; and if Ireland kept the Faith, it is due not only to the courage evoked by persecution, but in large measure to her own Catholic hedge-schools and to the Catholic schools of Belgium and France, where many of her clergy received their early training. In our own country within the last fifteen years vocations to the priesthood have increased to a percentage far in excess of the growth of the Catholic population, thanks to our parochial schools, and I have the word of a venerable Superior of a Seminary for it that these vocations are far more decided and reliable than in the past.

The duty of giving the first ecclesiastical training to candidates for the priesthood devolves, therefore, upon the rector of the parish inasmuch as he is the responsible director of the parochial school. In cases where he finds it impossible, owing to circumstances of a special nature, to have a Catholic school, and thus lacks the powerful help which Catholic teachers supply, his responsibility in the matter of guarding probable vocations to the priesthood is increased. The boys of his parish who aspire to the sacred ministry necessarily look up to the pastor for guidance and encouragement, and even, perhaps unconsciously yet effectually, pattern the idea of their future career after his own manner of living. His zeal, his self-denial, his orderly life, his devotedness to duty, his clerical spirit, influence their daily conduct and

often decide a vocation which the contrary habits would wreck. We need not here insist on the duty of a boy's confessor in a matter of such importance; the priest who neglects to be a zealous and wise director of such a youth evidently appreciates not the gift of God bestowed upon himself.

In every school, and in almost every First Communion class, one or more lads may be found whose bright eyes, honest looks, natural aptitude for learning and sunny disposition attracts the attention of the priest who has the future of the Church and the honor of the priesthood of his diocese at heart. They may be mischievous, but somehow they are always honest in acknowledging their faults; they are warm-hearted and impulsive yet modest, and ready to help their fellows without seeming mindful of the credit due to unselfishness. When you see a boy with such dispositions, who is moreover studious and conscientious in the school-room, reserved and as if instinctively reverent when in church, mark him, for such are the very elect of God. Only the teaching and care of the Catholic school is calculated to keep such souls in their native state of innocence; only daily observation of them in the school will reveal their generous nature to the zealous eye of the priest. They make good altar boys, provided the pastor exercises strict control over them and knows how to draw the line between the school-yard and the sacristy! They are certain to grow in the love of the sanctuary if only the priest enforces exterior reverence of demeanor as well as intelligent performance of church functions! Happy the priest who by timely sympathy can gain the friendship of such lads and become their trusted counselor; it makes him feel young again to foster their half-revealed ambition to become priests of God. And how helpful he will be to them when the inevitable struggle between the interested opposition of the parents and the generous aspirations of the youth makes the college step a difficult one to take! But—

What kind of a college shall the boy be sent to?

Legislating for the needs of the times, the Council of Trent thus describes the "*Method of establishing seminaries for clerics and of educating the same therein.* Whereas the age of youth, unless it be rightly trained, is prone to pursue the pleasures of the world; and, unless it be formed from its tender years unto piety and religion, before habits of vice have taken possession of the whole man, it never will perfectly and without the greatest, and we may say exceptional help of Almighty God, persevere in ecclesiastical discipline; the holy Synod ordains that all cathedral, metropolitan, and all other greater churches, shall be bound, each according to its means and the extent of the diocese, to maintain, to educate religiously, and to train in ecclesiastical discipline, a certain number of youths of their city and diocese, or—if that number cannot be found there—of that province, in a college to be chosen by the bishop for this purpose, near the said churches, or in some other suitable place. Into this college shall be received such as have reached at least their twelfth year, who are born in lawful wedlock, are familiar with the arts of reading and writing, and whose character and inclination afford a hope that they will always serve in the ecclesiastical ministry. The Council wishes, moreover, that the children of the poor be principally selected, though it does not indeed exclude those of the more wealthy, provided that they be maintained at their own expense, and clearly manifest the desire of serving God and the Church."[1] Seminaries, that is colleges wherein candidates devote themselves exclusively to the ecclesiastical state, not admitting students of the more liberal professions, but such only as pursue their clerical studies including the philosophical and theological courses, are the result of that radical legislation.

From what we have already said, there is no doubt that the establishment of such schools, where young men who aspired to the priesthood were secluded from the world and its then almost unavoidable corruption, was a necessity of the times. For some generations previous to the time of the

1 Sess. xxiii, Chap. xviii de Reform.

holding of the Council of Trent, (1542–1564) there were more seekers of benefices than candidates for the priesthood, and to secure a working clergy imbued with a noble desire for the salvation of souls, it became necessary to separate them from the beneficiaries whose houses they frequented and whose influence they sought to the neglect of study and of preparation for their sacred calling. On the other hand, the priests who did the actual work of the ministry, who received from the beneficiaries a mere living pittance for the fulfilment of the ecclesiastical obligations annexed to the enjoyment of the benefice, had come to look upon that ministry without responsibility as a perfunctory service requiring little knowledge and less exertion to accomplish the material performance of it. It will, therefore, be readily understood that radical measures were to be taken to effect a salutary and lasting reformation in the ranks of the clergy.

How effectually this was done is apparent from the methods which the Fathers of the Council of Trent prescribed for the training of the newly selected clerics. "The Bishop—having divided these youths into as many classes as he may judge proper, according to their number, age, and progress in ecclesiastical discipline—shall, when it seems to him expedient, assign some of them to the ministry of the churches, the others he shall keep in the college to be instructed; and he shall supply the places thus made vacant by others, that so this college may be a perpetual nursery of ministers of God. And in order that the youths may be more advantageously trained in the aforesaid ecclesiastical discipline, they shall from the first be obliged to wear the tonsure and the clerical dress; they shall give themselves to the study of grammar, chant, ecclesiastical computation, and the other liberal arts; they shall be instructed in Sacred Scripture, in the works of the Fathers, the homilies of the Saints, the manner of administering the Sacraments, and especially in those things which would seem adapted to enable them to hear confessions, and in the forms of the rites and ceremonies. The Bishop shall take care that they be present every day at the Sacrifice of the Mass; that they approach the confessional

at least once a month; and that they receive the Body of Our Lord Jesus Christ as the judgment of their confessors shall direct; on festivals they are to assist in the services of the Cathedral and other churches of the place." [1]

Nor did the Fathers of Trent neglect the necessary sanctions, without which the new legislation would soon have fallen into disuse. They guarded against misconduct and abuses by prescribing that the unruly and ill-disposed be summarily dismissed from the Seminary. After having laid down the duties of the pupils, they enact that "all these, and other things advantageous and necessary to promote the efficient training of clerics, should be enforced by each bishop, who is to take counsel of two of the senior and most experienced canons chosen by him, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost. These shall make it their care, by frequent visitations, to secure that their prescriptions and regulations be faithfully observed. The forward and incorrigible, and the disseminators of evil morals, they shall punish severely, and, if need be, exile them from the Seminary, so that, by removing all obstacles to good discipline, they foster whatsoever tends to the preservation and advancement of piety and holiness in the institution." [2]

The fact that the seminaries became fruitful nurseries of ecclesiastical vocations and of learned and pious priests, proves that the Fathers of the Council of Trent built wisely and well.

(*To be continued.*)

CAMILLUS P. MAES,
Bishop of Covington.

1 Conc. Trid. Sess. xxiii. Chap. xviii, de Reform.

2 Conc. Trid. Sess. xxiii. Cap. xviii, de Reform.

THE "EVER" AND "NEVER" OF PREACHING.

PREACHING is to speak in the name of Christ as His ambassador; it is to offer salvation to men by announcing the Gospel of truth and peace to those who are "of good will." It is a sublime function: "How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, of them that bring the glad tidings of good things." Rom. x, 15). To the people the preacher, the "*sacerdos, sacra docens*", appears as the "alter Christus"; for, marked with the sacerdotal character he comes "in nomine Domini." That character gives him the right and duty to preach the Word of God. St. Gregory says: "Praeconis officium suscipit quisquam ad sacerdotium accedit." This does not imply that every priest is chosen to be an orator, a Bossuet or a Burke, but every priest who has the care of souls is bound in conscience to use all his energy, to employ his knowledge, his industry and all the other gifts which the Lord granted him, to announce the Gospel with power, dignity and fruit. The orator is not born nor does he fall from the sky; history tells us that our great pulpit orators became masters of sacred eloquence by long years of prayer and mortification, by deep and continued study of the sacred sciences, especially the study of the Bible. Every priest may become a good and effective preacher if, trusting in God's assistance, he use rightly the faculties of his soul and body; and thus he may accomplish for his own generation what the Fathers and Doctors of old did for theirs. But hard work is necessary, work that can not be dispensed with despite years or a long practice. "Etenim cum eloquentiam non natura, sed disciplina pariat, licet ad summum ejus apicem quis pervenerit, ab illa certe destituetur, nisi *assidue* studio et exercitatione illam excoluerit[1]." These are the words of that magnificent pulpit orator, St. John Chrysostom. Even for one possessed of the best powers as a natural orator the adage will hold good: "Qui ascendit sine labore, descendit sine honore." No matter how learned and experienced a

1 St. Chrysostomus, *De Sacerdotio*, V. 5.

man may be, if he attempts to preach without preparation, he may *talk* well and use fine gestures, but he will say little or nothing of any permanent value to his hearers. Whilst an overweening confidence in their natural gifts misleads many to dispense with the hard labor of careful preparation, we find others prevented from accomplishing much by a lack of courage. We should remember that the possible is within our reach. If a young priest convinces himself that he has the necessary talent, if he will only try, difficulties will gradually vanish before his energy, he may be sure to succeed in announcing the word of God in a manner which will attract, not only by its plain, good language, but frequently by a certain originality which comes from sincere effort. Truth is old, the manner of preaching may be ever new, as God gives new gifts to every individual preacher.

No man is creative in the strict sense of the word. The material of our thoughts are our knowledge of self, our experience, all we have ever thought, felt, read and heard. That which gives originality to our speech is simply conception and combination. The work of a musical composer consists in combination, not in the invention of new scales or sounds. Others have said the same that we have to say, but they have not said it in the same way. Let the young preacher realize that it does not require genius to become a good preacher, but that zeal, charity and piety are qualifications absolutely necessary. We would say to him: do not slavishly copy the sermons of any man, but use your intelligence in meditating on your subject, dividing it, looking for arguments and illustrations to support its thesis. After you have thought the subject over and digested the matter, then, we should suggest the reading of a good sermon on the same subject, nor is there any reason why we should not make the thoughts and expressions of another our own when they are calculated to impress the hearer forcibly. But it must be remembered that, on the whole, our own sermons, however deficient and poor they may be, will have a better effect on our people than the sermons of Bourdaloue, or other great orators, because these will never suit our habits of

thought nor those of our people. A man is always eloquent on what he knows thoroughly and what he has thought and felt himself. We will always preach a good sermon if our minds and hearts be full of our subject, if we can forget ourselves entirely, and only think of Him in whose name we are speaking. Mistakes in grammar, pronunciation and gestures are easily overlooked if the preacher be a man of God and fully conscious of his sublime mission. Brownson tells us that the sermon that effected him more and provoked more rigid self examination than almost any other to which he had ever listened, was one on "the sign of the cross," preached by a man who mispronounced almost every other word, and had hardly a sentence of correct English from beginning to end. And he goes on to say that "the most effective preachers are not your most learned and accomplished pulpit orators who never transgress a single propriety or deviate from a single conventional rule, but the meek and humble minded, who think only of Christ and Him crucified."[1] But it must not be inferred that a preacher is dispensed from the duty of perfecting himself with regard to those things which are usually deemed externals in preaching. He is bound to avoid everything that mars the beauty of the divine message. He is bound to set it forth, as far as may be, in the choicest language. The Gospel is the "pearl of heaven" which should be set in a neat and precious casing to show off its beauty and make it all the more attractive. As on the altar, so in the pulpit, the priest's outward bearing should be faultless. Even the poor and uncultivated expect good manners in one whose rule of life and constant preaching is the charity of Christ. There are certain defects in manner and voice that become offensive in the pulpit; and it is in most cases comparatively easy to overcome these by attention and persistent effort to correct them.

There are, however, other defects which arise, not so much from a faulty manner, as perhaps from a lack of judgment and reflection, or else from a want of experience in

1 Brownson's Works, Vol. XX, p. 202.

dealing with men. They may be referred principally to the treatment or mention in the pulpit of certain topics, some of which should never be heard from the lips of the preacher, while others should be so handled as to make them subservient or contributory to the enforcement of truth and virtue, subjects which are to be forever the themes of the minister of truth and guardian of innocence. For the purpose of bringing home more directly our meaning and aim, we have put our argument in form of cautions indicating the "never," and, by implication, the "ever" of preaching:

1.—*Never* make money the subject of your sermon. You may have to speak about a collection or pew rent, or some other revenue of the church. It is the sacred duty of most priests in the United States to do so; it is a serious and important part of his ministry. Nevertheless, leave it out of your sermons or instructions. This matter belongs to the "announcements," which should be made in an earnest and dignified, though kind and fatherly manner, before the reading of the Sunday Gospel. Even then the words used should show forth consideration and prudence. The Third Council of Baltimore is clear on the money question: "De stipendiorum aut reddituum tenuitate saepe saepius verba facere, praesertim asperiori modo, summopere dedecet ministrum Christi et locum sacrum."

2.—*Never* preach on vice, that is, never make any vice directly and nominally the subject of your preaching. Graphic descriptions of vice destroy the shy tenderness of conscience, and disturb the peace and tranquillity of innocent souls. Therefore, never preach on drunkenness, impurity, theft, cursing a. s. f., but preach on temperance, purity, honesty, the sacredness of God's name. What do the people gain from those formidable sermons on vice? Some will imitate the Pharisee, and thank God that they are not like those "painted red" by the preacher; others will feel guilty, ashamed and embittered on account of having been exposed; others may even be taught the "mystery of iniquity," perhaps be enticed to sin; others will again wonder and

ask, where did the preacher get his knowledge of vice? Generally speaking, the audience is not composed of great sinners, but of weak, lukewarm Christians, who realize their short-comings, and need encouragement rather than condemnation.

3.—*Never* mention persons nor allude to individuals, censuring them or finding fault with them. It could not produce any good, but cause injury to others and yourself. "Nomina semper sint odiosa." "Concionator neminem adstantium, quae intolerabilis audacia foret, nominatim reprehendat, aut insidiosa verborum circuitione ita notet designetque ut ab omnibus nosci facile possit." (Conc. Balt. III, 215).

4.—*Never* resent in the pulpit any personal injury. You are in God's place; forget yourself completely. Erase the letter "I" from your vocabulary. Do not profane the sacred office with personal grievances. The Second Council of Baltimore warns the preacher: "ad privatam injuriam ulciscendam sacro loco et tempore abuti nequaquam audeat."

5.—*Never* scold nor speak in anger; rather praise on every lawful opportunity. It does not require much skill or any extraordinary talent to scold people or use harsh language for the purpose of correcting them. Do not interrupt your sermon to rebuke people who cough, laugh, talk or come late; such comments are sure to spoil the good effect of your preaching.

6.—*Never* ridicule people or imitate their peculiarities in manner or language. The "Irish brogue," the "German accent," the "Canadian dialect" may amuse people at a "variety show;" they should never be the cause of merriment or disapprobation in the house of the Lord.

7.—*Never* attack any profession as such. Remarks like the following are unchristian: "Doctors are all quacks; they kill more people than they cure. Lawyers are rogues who cheat the people; they have no conscience, but are only looking for their own interests. Beware of school teachers," etc.

8.—*Never* blame people for their nationality; never ascribe

to them *national* sins, saying, the Germans are misers, the Irish are drunkards, the Italians are murderers. The preacher must be above nationalism; he must hate and detest it as a vice which he has the duty to root out if it exist in his congregation. "There is no difference between the Jew and the Greek: for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon Him." (Rom. x, 12.)

9.—*Never* speak against American institutions or customs; nor belittle them by praising foreign laws, habits and practices. Love the land that protects you, and the great government which never interferes with the free and bold announcement of Christ's holy religion.

10.—*Never* attack Protestants as such, though you may have occasion to show that Protestanism is inconsistent and untrue. Attacking Protestants does not convert them; on the contrary, it irritates and often prevents conversion. Speak always kindly of Protestants as our "dissenting brethren," our "Protestant friends;"—and real friends they often are and show themselves. "Non sinet ut heterodoxis, si qui forte concioni adsint, justa detur offensae causa." (Conc. Balt. III, 215).

11.—*Never* use irony or sarcasm or words of contempt in the pulpit when speaking of persons. Such methods of speech inflict wounds that rarely or never heal. Christ sent us to cure and not to wound, to offer the soothing balm and the healing and strengthening oil of His doctrine; He gave us the "ministerium reconciliationis."

12.—*Never* make use of silly jokes or vulgar stories in the Church to produce merriment. If you find that some great preachers have told funny and amusing things in the pulpit and caused roars of laughter in the audience, kindly remember, "Quod licet Iovi, non licet bovi." People do not attend church to be amused by the priest.

> "He that negotiates between God and man,
> As God's ambassador, the great concerns
> Of judgment and of mercy, should beware
> Of lightness in his speech. 'Tis pitiful
> To court a grin, when one should woo a soul."
>
> —*Cowper.*

13.—*Never* speak about local politics or the political parties of the country, neither in praise or condemnation. We are working for Christ's kingdom, not for political influence; wherefore the Third Council of Baltimore gives preachers the "caveant ne temere de rebus politicis aut aliis quae minime ad eorum ministerium pertinent sermones ad populum faciant." In church, our Catholic people seek rest from the noise and bustle of every day life, from the discordant sounds of human strife and warring politics. They come to church to free their minds from the disagreeable scenes of the world; they have no desire to be reminded of political discussions and sensational newspaper talk.

14.—*Never* preach on any subject which is purely secular. The end of all preaching must be the salvation of souls. Temporal prosperity, national progress and the like, are not the proper subjects for sermons. "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and all other things will be added unto you." (Matth. vi, 33.)

15.—*Never* introduce in your sermon interpretations of Holy Scripture which are contrary to the received sense of the Church and the Holy Fathers. "Evangelium ergo illibatum diligenter et absque ullius erroris suspicione concionator sacer exponat." (Conc. Balt. III.) Do not use Protestant Commentaries. Why go to the turbid fountain when the limpid stream of Catholic science is flowing by your side? Protestant writers may throw a natural charm on the sacred page, but we are thirsting for the beauty supernatural.

16.—*Never* relate doubtful stories in your sermons, no matter how applicable they appear. Not even the shadow of untruth must ever darken the Catholic pulpit, the chair of truth. "Ineptae autem et aniles fabulae ne e suggesto enarrentur ipsa ratio suadet. Hoc modo doctrina Catholica non illustratur, sed acatholicorum ludibrio exponitur cum rubore et scandalo fidelium." (Conc. Balt. l. c,)

17.—*Never* speak about new revelations, visions, miracles that have no solid foundation or that have not been investigated and approved by the bishop of the diocese or the Holy See. "Carissimi, nolite omni spiritui credere, sed *probate*

spiritus si a Deo sint: quoniam multi pseudoprophetae exierunt in mundum," (I Joan, iv, 1.) The preacher's field is sufficiently large to offer him abundance of matter. Why leave the solid territory of divine revelation?

18.—*Never* discuss theological opinions or advert to controversies among Catholic theologians. Theological opinions belong to the school of Theology and not to the pulpit, where no question should ever be treated so as to suggest doubts regarding a Catholic doctrine. People would be scandalized to hear that learned men in the Church cannot agree in matters of religion, even though their disagreement be about non-essentials.

19.—*Never* speak about the particular time of the Last Judgment, or the time of Antichrist's arrival, similar declarations resting upon some private prophecies, though ascribed to holy men. Ad quid bonum? What good effect have such questions on your people? St. Paul calls them "inutiles et vanae." God does not want us to inquire about the time which He has reserved to Himself.

20.—*Never* exaggerate the truth in the pulpit, especially in its application to every day life. Follow the golden "via media." Sermons, "ex professo," on the small number of the elect, on the narrow road that leads to heaven, etc., seldom produce conversions, but very frequently discouragement.

21.—*Never* minimize the Catholic Faith for fear of offending people. Give the full truth, no matter how harsh it may sound at first and how bitter it may taste. Elegant phrases will not create any happiness in hell, nor will they save people wilfully dwelling outside of the one saving Church. Faith is truth, and truth is life. Our Lord assures us that His truth shall make us free. It will give us the true liberty of the children of God, by freeing the mind from ignorance and the heart from sin. Banish timidity by invoking the mighty Spirit of God. "Melius est laudabile bellum pace a Deo dijungente: ob eamque causam lenem et mansuetum hominem Spiritus ad pugnam armat, ut qui bellum recte gerere queat."—(St. Greg. Naz. De Fuga, n. 82.)

22.—*Never* speak on subjects the knowledge of which came to you solely through the confessional. Never say: "I heard in confession," or "a man told me in confession one day," etc. People would surely be scandalized, as they consider (erroneously) such expressions a revelation of sins, a breaking of the sigillum.

23.—*Never* speak against civil or spiritual authority. "Honor to whom honor is due," says the Apostle. "There is no authority," either civil or spiritual, "which is not from God." Therefore, authority is something divine. Never speak against the President of the Union, the Governor of the State, the Mayor of the City, etc. Foster respect for authority; all the more since thoughtful men remark that this respect is decreasing in the United States. Above all, cultivate a sincere reverence in the people for the ecclesiastical authority. Never say a disrespectful word of a priest, bishop or the Pope. You are not constituted a judge. The priest is to be judged by his bishop, the bishop by the Pope, the Pope by God alone. This is the God-given order which we must preach to the people. The famous Savonarola would deserve a place on our altars had he but observed this rule.

24.—*Never* attack the Public Schools, condemning them in a wholesale manner, calling them sinks of iniquity, hotbeds of vice, schools for paupers. The American Public School is an excellent institution, as far as it goes. Nothing prevents you from often insisting on the necessity of religious education for Catholic children; proving that the Public Schools are defective or insufficient for the education of the whole man.

25.—*Never* preach on fashion, condemning certain styles of dress, headgear of ladies, bangs, etc. "Praeterit enim figura hujus mundi." Fashion, like the world itself, continually changes, and you will not stop the changing. Preaching against fashion will produce either amusement or irritation, but no good whatsoever. Americans have little to complain of on the score of modesty in dress. Nowhere in the world is Christian decorum better ob-

served in this respect than in America, especially with ladies.

These are some of the shoals and rocks of which the preacher must steer clear that his words may not lose their intended effect.

WM. STANG.

American College, Louvain, Belgium.

THE UNION OF THE CHURCHES.

REJOINDER TO THE PATRIARCH OF CONSTANTINOPLE.

VIII.

THE reasons which moved the Most Excellent Patriarch of Constantinople to reject the appeal for union, made to him and his subjects by the Roman Pontiff, may be reduced, as has been shown in a previous paragraph (III) of these papers, to one head, namely, to the *anti-evangelical innovations* which the Bishops of Rome are said to have introduced into their church.

The first of the alleged reasons has reference to the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and Son, and is perhaps the most important, since to it the origin of the schism is falsely attributed.[1] Let us hear what the Patriarch says of it in his *Encyclical letter:* "The one, holy, catholic

1 P. Michel, in his recent work *L'Orient et Rome* (Paris, Lecoffre, 1895), very well demonstrates that "the schism of the Churches was not the result of a theological difference, but rather that the latter was a consequence of the former." Further information on this point may be gained by consulting Cardinal Hergenröther's classic work, *Photius, Patriarch von Constantinopel* (Regensburg, 1867): Bottalla, *The Papacy and Schism* (London, 1869); Tosti, *Storia dello Scisma Greco* (Florence 1856); De Luise, *Lo Scisma Greco al tribunale della verità* (Naples, 1869), and in general the more important historians of the Church.

and apostolic Church *of the seven Ecumenical Councils*, according to the Gospel precepts, believed and taught that the *Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father;* but in the West, *from the ninth century*, the holy symbol of faith composed and approved by the Ecumenical Councils was gradually falsified, and the idea that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son also began to be spread *arbitrarily*. Certainly Pope Leo XIII is not ignorant of the fact that his orthodox predecessor and namesake, a defender of orthodoxy, Leo III, in 809, by a synodical decree *rejected* and *condemned* the anti-evangelical and ill-advised addition *Filioque*."[1]

Before showing that the reason here advanced by the Patriarch is not of any theological value, let us briefly point out the principal errors upon which it is based. The Patriarch asserts that the Church of the *seven* Ecumenical Councils *taught* that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father. Now it is an historical fact that the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father was not *taught* by the *seven* Councils, but it was so taught only by the Council of Constantinople towards the end of the *fourth century*. It was this Council which, in 381, first altered the public and explicit profession of the Catholic faith on the subject, by an addition to the symbol composed and approved by the preceding Ecumenical Council of Nice.

Furthermore, the Patriarch asserts that the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son was not known in the West before the IX century, at which

1 "Ἡ μία λοιπὸν, ἁγία, καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ Ἐκκλησία τῶν ἑπτὰ Οἰκουμενικῶν Συνόδων ἐπίστευε καὶ ἐδογμάτιζε συνῳδὰ τοῖς εὐαγγελικοῖς ῥήμασιν, ὅτι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον ἐκπορεύεται ἐκ τοῦ Πατρός· ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ Δύσει ἀπὸ τοῦ Θ' ἤδη αἰῶνος ἤρξατο παραχαράττεσθαι τὸ ἱερὸν τῆς πίστεως σύμβολον τὸ συνταχθὲν καὶ κυρωθὲν ὑπὸ Συνόδων Οἰκουμενικῶν, καὶ διαδίδοσθαι αὐθαιρέτως ἡ ἰδέα, ὅτι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον ἐκπορεύεται καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ. Οὐδόλως δὲ ἀγνοεῖ βεβαίως ὁ πάπας Λέων ὁ ΙΓ', ὅτι ὁ ὀρθόδοξος προκάτοχος καὶ συνώνυμος αὐτῷ καὶ τῆς ὀρθοδοξίας πρόμαχος Λέων ὁ Γ', τῷ 809 συνοδικῶς ἀπεκήρυξε τὴν ἀντευαγγελικὴν καὶ πανάθεσμον ταύτην προσθήκην "καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ (filioque.)" *Encyclical Letter.* §. 7.

time, he says, it began to be spread arbitrarily in the Latin Church. This statement is likewise contradicted by the irrefragable evidence of documents, such as, for example, the authentic Acts of the Councils of Galicia (447), of Toledo (589 and 633), of Frankfort (794),[1] besides numerous other documents which attest that the above mentioned doctrine was known and publicly professed in Spain, in Gaul and in Germany before the ninth century.[2] Photius himself, despite his bold assumptions, did not dare to deny that SS. Ambrose, Hilary, Augustine, Jerome and other Latin Fathers knew and publicly taught in the West that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father and from the Son. Now all these Fathers flourished in the fourth and fifth centuries of the Church. In any case the Patriarch ought not to have been ignorant of the declaration made by his own illustrious predecessor in the patriarchal see of Constantinople, Metrophanus II. The latter, writing in June, 1441, "to the holy monks and spiritual fathers, priests and religious, nobles and all the rest of the Christian people of the Lord living in Modone," affirms that "after many researches and disputes which took place in the holy Council of Florence, it appeared clear *to many and great saints of the West*, especially to those whom we also recognize and venerate as holy and acknowledge as our masters, that the very same opinion which the Latins of *to-day* hold concerning the procession of the Holy Ghost *was and is the formula and time-honored belief* of those blessed holy men and leaders."[3]

IX.

Much might also be said of the false accusation which the Patriarch makes against Leo III in his *Encyclical*. He al-

1 See Denzinger, *Enchiridion Symbolorum et Definitionum*, Edit. 6; Wirceburgi, 1888, p. 14, *El Concilio III de Toledo*, Edizione Poliglotta, Madrid, 1891, p. 14; Labbe, *Coll. Conciliorum*, Tom. 5, p. 1009 e segg., Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, Freiburg, 1873.

2 *Liber de S. Spiritus Mystagogia* nn. 66-72. Migne, P. G. vol. 102, pp. 343-351.

3 The codex which contains this letter is preserved in the Marciana Library of Venice under No. cvii, 5. See Secchi Sen, *La Cattedra Alessandrina di S. Marco*. (Venice, 1853, pp. 294-297)

leges that the Pontiff "in 809 by a synodal decree rejects and condemns the anti-evangelical and ill-omened addition of the *Filioque*." This is an old calumny which has been copied from a letter of Photius to the Metropolitan of Aquileja,[1] and afterwards *blindly*[2] copied by others, among whom, in 1848, we find the namesake and predecessor of the present Patriarch.[3]

In the solution of this difficulty we must take account of three distinct questions; i. e., the teaching of the dogma; the simple fact of the addition, to the creed of the word *Filioque;* the recitation or *chanting* of the creed with the addition of the *Filioque*, in the sacred Liturgy.[4] Has the action of Leo III any reference to the definition of the dogma? Certainly not. Or does it prohibit the simple addition of the *Filioque* at a time when there was as yet no necessity for making it? Even this cannot be said with certainty. What Leo III wished to impress upon the legates of the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle was that they had no authority to make the addition in the *public chant* of the creed. It was a question merely of liturgical observance. This is evident from the authentic account which Abbot Smaragdus, who was present at the Conference held by the Pope with the aforementioned legates, has left us.[5] The answer of Leo

1 See Migne, P. G. Vol. 102. p. 799; Jager, *Histoire de Photius*, p. 452; Hergenröther, op. cit.

2 We say *blindly* because none of the copyists ever thought of correcting the date (809) of the supposed "synodical decree" of Leo III. The *Conference* concerning the *Filoque* with the Legates of Aix-la Chapelle was held in Rome not in 809, but in 810. See Jaffé, *Regesta Roman. Pontif.* 2 ed. Leipzig. 1885, Tom I, p. 313; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, Freiburg, 1873, vol. 3, p 754

3 *Encyclical Letter of Anthimos*, published in 1848 from the Patriarchal printing office. For a brief refutation of this document see the *Civiltà Cattolica* of 1852 (Ser. II, vol. VI, pag. 423.)

4 See Benedict XIV, *Bullarium*, Const, 47, § 30, Ed. Prati 1847, Tom. III, part 2, p. 263.

5 Smaragdi, *Abbatis Monasterii S. Michaelis Virdunensis*, Opera Omnia. Ed Migne, 1851, P. L. vol. 102, p. 976. See also the *Annales Ecclesiastici* of Baronius, Ed. Venturini, Lucae, 1743, Tom. xiii, p. 456; Grisar, *Leo III*,

III was couched in the following words: *Quod iam nunc a quibusque prius nescientibus recte creditur*, (*i. e.* The Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and from the Son) *credatur; et tamen illicita cantandi consuetudo, sine cuiusque fidei laesione tollatur.* Surely this is very plain. Leo III had to sustain, on the one hand, the dogmatic truth of the procession of the Holy Ghost also from the Son; and, on the other hand, he was obliged to guard the integrity of the public liturgy of the Church by reason of his supreme authority. In giving the above answer, which was by no means a *synodical decree*, as the Patriarch falsely asserts, the Pontiff far from posing as a partisan or precursor of Photius, as the Patriarch of Constantinople would have us believe from his *Encyclical*, declares himself one of his strenuous opposers.

With regard to the *falsification* of the creed with which the Patriarch charges the Roman Church, because she added the *Filioque*, it suffices to observe that the Church in making this addition for the purpose of explaining to the faithful more clearly the truth implicitly contained in it, has exercised the same authority which she is allowed to have had in the Council of Constantinople.[1] The simple addition, therefore, of the *Filioque* made to the Constantinopolitan Symbol, like the other *qui a Patre procedit* made before to the Nicene Symbol by the Fathers of Constantinople, cannot be said to be a *falsification*, unless it be proven to be opposed to Catholic doctrine, which the Patriarch neither does nor can do.

in the *Kirchenlexicon*, Ed. 2, Freiburg, 1891, pp. 1771 and fol. The same is admitted by the anti-Catholic Langen, *Die Trinitarische Lehrdifferenz*, Bonn, 1876, p. 122.

1 In regard to this question it will be well to observe what St. Thomas says: "Processio Spiritûs Sancti a Filio implicite in Symbolo Constantinopolitano continetur, in quantum continetur ibi quod procedit a Patre; quia quod de Patre intelligitur, oportet et de Filio intelligi, cum in nullo differant, nisi quia hic est Filius et ille Pater. Sed propter insurgentes errores eorum qui Spiritum a Filio esse negabant, conveniens fuit ut in Symbolo poneretur, non quasi aliquid additum, sed *explicite interpretatum quod implicite continebatur.* Sicut si insurgeret haeresis quae negaret Spiritum Sanctum esse factorem coeli et terrae, oporteret hoc explicite poni, cum in praedicto Symbolo hoc non dicatur nisi de Patre." (De Potent. q, 10, Art. 4.)

Bessarion understood this well. In the Council of Florence he asked the Greeks to ascertain first if the addition of the *Filioque* to the Symbol were or were not conformable to divine revelation; for, said he, *ostensa falsitate dogmatis, quaestio de illo non addendo non habebit deinceps locum.* If, on the other hand, the truth of the *Filioque* is established, we need not ask if it be permissible to add it to the creed, for, said he, *ridiculum est existimare non oportere veritatem Symbolo addere.* Afterwards, the Greeks, remaining obstinate in their false view, were reduced to such straits *ut non habentes quod responderent, obmutuerint; quid enim aliquis contra tantam veritatem impudens responderet?*[1]

X.

But the Patriarch, and with him all the followers of Photius, seek to assail Catholic doctrine with the Gospel, by having recourse to that celebrated passage, in which Christ, speaking of the Holy Ghost, says: *Qui a Patre procedit—* ὃ παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται.[2] But they neglect to observe: first, that the text of St. John, even in its mutilated form, does not prove the contention of the Photian party; and, secondly, that, read as it should be, with the context, it plainly proves the Catholic doctrine. Let us see what the text quoted says. That *the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father.* No Catholic in the Church of Rome ventures to deny this; on the contrary, the Church of Rome teaches it. What the Latins deny is this: that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father *only*, and this the text does not say. Our adversaries mistake a simple *affirmative* proposition for an *exclusive* one. To prove that the doctrine of the Roman Church is *anti-evangelical* the Greeks would have to show that this or any other text of the Gospel which treats of the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father contains some

1 Bessarion, *De Processione Spiritûs Sancti.* Ed. Migne, P. G. Vol. 161, pp. 338 and fol.

2 John xv, 26. In citing the Greek text of the Gospels we shall follow the critical edition of Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Ed. critica minor ex viii maiore desumpta, Leipzig, 1872.

element of exclusion, such as the particles *alone*, *only*. But since they neither do nor can do this, because such a text is not to be found in any of the four Gospels, they lose their time and labor in repeating the aforementioned text, for we must answer them, as has been done a thousand times before, that the affirmation of one truth does not destroy the affirmation of another, unless it be in contradiction to the former; and that one truth cannot lessen the force of another which is implicitly contained in it. We shall see that this is verified in the present case, whence we conclude that the statement of the Holy Ghost proceeding from the Father does not exclude the fact that He proceeds from the Son *also*.

Thus when Christ says of Himself that He is the Son of man, *Filius hominis*, does He exclude the fact that He is *also* the Son of God? And when, in the vi. chapter of St. John, He says: *Pater meus dat vobis panem de coelo verum* does He exclude the fact that He *also* gives that bread? Must it not be said rather that by saying that the Father is the principle of the Holy Ghost the same is affirmed of the Son, as we know from the testimony of Christ that whatsoever the Father has the Son has also: *omnia, quaecumque habet Pater, mea sunt.*[1] If this testimony of Christ is true, without doubt it follows that the text which affirms that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father, *implicitly* teaches that He proceeds from the Son also, as from one breathing principle, since all things are common to both, if we except paternity and sonship, the distinctive essential quality of each: *in divinis omnia sunt unum, ubi non obviat relationis oppositio.*[2]

We said in the second place that the above-cited words of St. John with their context, prove rather the Catholic dogma. Here is the text: Cum autem venerit Paracletus, *quem Ego mittam vobis a Patre*, Spiritus veritatis qui a Patre procedit, ille testimonium perhibebit de me.[3] Here Christ frankly

1 John xvi, 15.

2 Eugenii iv. *Decretum pro Iacobitis*, Denzinger, op. cit. p. 165.

3 ὅταν ἔλθῃ ὁ παράκλητος ἐγὼ πέμψω ὑμῖν παρὰ τοῦ πατρός, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας ὃ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται, ἐκεῖνος μαρτυρήσει περὶ ἐμοῦ.

declares that the Spirit, who proceeds from the Father, *is sent by Him.* Now the idea of sending *in divinis* includes the idea of origin and procession of the person sent from the person sending, and although this sending, with reference to the external operation, manifests itself in time, yet with reference to the internal principle it has its origin in eternity. Whence it is that Christ, when He explained His mission from the Father, adduced as its reason His procession from the Father: *Ego ex Deo processi et veni; neque enim a meipso veni, sed ille me misit.*[1] This same theology, taught by Christ Himself, was taught after Him by the Fathers. As an example we shall cite St. Gregory the Great, who in his XXVI homily[2] declares that the sending of the Holy Ghost is one and the same thing as His procession from the Father and the Son. *Eius missio ipsa processio est, qua de Patre procedit et Filio.* Hence in the Gospel at one time the Holy Ghost is said to be sent by the Son in the name of the Father, and at another time by the Father in the name of the Son, to indicate His origin from both.

St. Gregory flourished three centuries before Photius, and is honored by the Greeks themselves as a Doctor of the Church. Will the Patriarch reprove the Church of Rome for following his doctrine?

XI.

The gravest of all the charges made by the Patriarch against the Church of Rome is certainly that in which he calls her "the corrupter of the writings of the Fathers of the Church." *ἡ δὲ νῦν ρωμαϊκή ἐστιν Ἐκκλησία τῶν καινοτομιῶν, τῆς νοθεύσεως τῶν συγγραμμάτων τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν Πατέρων.* It is an accusation made as if by chance, which offers no shadow of proof so as to allow us, even remotely, to ascertain its truth. The intelligent reader will readily understand its polemical value. The Patriarch knows very well that the Church of Rome has repeatedly convinced the separated Eastern Churches that they have receded from the teaching of the

1 IOANN. VIII, 42. *ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθον καὶ ἥκω, οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ ἐλήλυθα, ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνός με ἀπέστειλεν.*

2 Migne, P. L. vol. 76, p. 1198.

ancient Fathers, especially with regard to the Procession of the Holy Ghost "from the Son also," and in general with regard to those doctrines concerning which they accuse the Church of Rome of innovations. The works of these Fathers are not hidden treasures; critical edition of them, published by the best ancient and modern Catholic and anti-Catholic authorities, are accessible to everybody, and, it will be easy, therefore, to verify the testimonies cited by the Church of Rome. Being unable to deny this incontestable fact the Patriarch was constrained to have recourse to the gratuitous, and we may say absurd subterfuge of rejecting these witnesses *a priori* as "falsifications" of Rome.

Certain followers of Photius had attempted to do the same in the Council of Florence, but they were confounded and silenced, by the celebrated Bessarion, who showed them how puerile and absurd was the assumption (for which no justification was offered) that so many and different books and autographs, held in the greatest veneration, could be interpolated or corrupted in all parts of the world where they were to be found.

But in our days, and especially in Europe, such gratuitous accusations carry no weight among learned men. They want critical and solid proofs, and we respectfully ask the Patriarch to give us such. We would even facilitate this task for him by noting that in a preceding paragraph we have cited against the cause which he defends the authorities of SS. Hilary, Ambrose, Augustin, Jerome, Vincent of Lerins and Gregory the Great. To these let us add a few of the best known Greek Fathers, such as SS. Athanasius,[1] Gregory of Nyssa,[2] Epiphanius,[3] Cyril of Alexandria,[4] all

1 *Epist. I ad Serap*, nn. 21 and 22. Migne, P. G. vol. 26, pp. 576 and 579.

2 *De Oratione Dominica*, Sermo III. Mai, *Script. Veter. Nova Collectio.* Tom. vii, p. ii, p. 39.

3 *Ancor.* nn. 6, 7, 8, 11. Of all these passages of St. Epiphanius, which could be increased indefinitely, we must quote the following eloquent, though short extract: *Τολμῶ λέγειν, οὐδὲ τὸ Πνεῦμά τις οἶδεν, εἰ μὴ ὁ Πατὴρ καὶ ὁ Υἱὸς παρ᾽ οὗ ἐκπορεύεται, καὶ παρ᾽ οὗ λαμβάνει.* (n. 11.). Migne, P. G. vol. 43, p. 13.

4 *Thesaurus*, Ass. 34. Migne, P. G. vol. 75, p. 586.

of whom, with one accord, confirm the antiquity and truth of the doctrine taught by the Church of Rome, i. e., that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and from the Son, or from the Father through the Son: ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ.[1]

Now all these testimonies have been accurately examined by us and verified *in fonte*. We were not satisfied to collate them only with the Migne edition, which we have cited for the convenience of our readers, because it is most in use, but we have consulted also other critical editions, among them the most recent, *Corpus Scriptorum*, which is in course of publication in Vienna. We were anxious, moreover, to compare them with the ancient manuscript codices, preserved in the Vatican Library, which were accessible to us, and will be to all who are desirous of ascertaining the truth. One of these, containing the magnificent testimony of St. Gregory of Nyssa, in these words: τὸ δὲ ἅγιον πνεῦμα καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς λέγεται, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ εἶναι προσμαρτυρεῖται,[2] goes back to the end of the eighth, or rather to the seventh century, that is, about two hundred years before the time of Photius, when there was not as yet any controversy concerning this dogma.

If, therefore, the illustrious Patriarch would jusify the grave accusation made by him against the Church of Rome of "falsifying the works of the Fathers" let him prove it at least by an equally precise and accurate reference to testimonies such as we have cited, and let him do it by similar evidence to that which we have offered in the preceding number, by showing that he *falsified* in his, "Encyclical"

1 These two formulas, corresponding to the Latin *ex Filio, per Filium*, were received by the Greeks in the Council of Florence as equivalent and orthodox expressions. S. Thomas Aquinas, who wrote his *Summa Theologica* two centuries before this Council had already observed: "Quia Filius habet a Patre quod ab eo procedat Spiritus Sanctus, potest dici quod Pater *per* Filium spiret Spiritum Sanctum, vel quod Spiritus Sanctus procedat a Patre per Filium, *quod idem est*" (Quaest. xxxvi, art. 3.) See Langen, op. cit. p. 125.

2 "Sanctus autem Spiritus et e Patre dicitur et ex Filio esse, testimonio probatur." For access to these sources we are indebted to the co-operation of the erudite P. Ehrle, acting custodian of the Vatican Library.

the text of the *Apostolic Letter* of Leo XIII, in substituting for the words *liturgical practices and sacred rites* used by the Pontiff, the words *dogmatical and canonical maxims* which are never once mentioned by him.

XII.

But let us return to our task. The stability of Christian belief, whilst it does not admit any change of dogma, as we have shown in the preceding article, nevertheless not only admits, but distinctly requires a certain development and varied application of the same. This it is and nothing else that the Roman Church has done in defining the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son also. Far from destroying the old dogma of the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father, this definition only confirmed it, by declaring explicitly that which, according to the teaching of Catholic tradition, is implicitly contained in it. Hence we have here not a change but a progressive *development* of dogma.

The same must be said of the other so called dogmatic *innovation* to which the Patriarch of Constantinople refers in his charge against the Church of Rome. "She," he says, "some forty years ago, made another innovation by establishing a *new dogma* of the Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God and ever Virgin Mary."[1] Our readers know well in what this dogma consists; nevertheless it may be useful to recall the precise words of Pope Pius IX. who on the morning of December 8, 1854, seconding the desires of the entire episcopate and of the faithful throughout the world, declared and defined in the Vatican Basilica *inter Missarum solemnia* that "the doctrine which teaches that the Most Blessed Virgin Mary was by a singular grace and privilege of Almighty God, in view of the merits of Jesus Christ the Redeemer of the human race, preserved intact from the stain of original sin from the first moment of her conception, is a

1 ἡ παπικὴ Ἐκκλησία ἐκαινοτόμησε πάλιν μόλις πρὸ τεσσαράκονταετίας, δογματίσασα καινοφανὲς δόγμα περὶ ἀσπίλου συλλήψεως τῆς Θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας. Encyclica Letter § 19.

doctrine revealed by God and therefore to be firmly and constantly believed by all the faithful."

The mere reading of these words is sufficient to show that the Pope does not intend by this *new dogmatic decree* to establish a *new doctrine*, but simply declares and defines that this doctrine regarding the preeminent sanctity and purity of the Most Holy Virgin, being comprehended in the universal belief of the Church, is a doctrine revealed by God and *for this reason* to be firmly believed by all the members of the Catholic Church: *atque idcirco ab omnibus fidelibus firmiter constanterque credendam.*

When, therefore, we come to inquire whether the immunity from original sin in Mary is or is not an *anti-evangelical innovation*, we inquire simply whether or not it is so contained in the universal belief which the Church always professed with regard to the sanctity of Mary. Now there is no intelligent person who in view of the present state of ecclesiastical erudition can have the least doubt on this point. The idea of this conception which is drawn from the writings of the Christian Fathers, from the most ancient liturgies, from the hymns and canticles with which the pastors of the churches were wont to make their people honor Mary, implies a sanctity which outruns all the ordinary ways of Providence, a sanctity in which everything is new and unusual, a sanctity greater than that of the cherubim and seraphim, a sanctity which transcends our imagination, and, is therefore, incapable of being honored in a worthy manner. The idea of her purity as understood in the Church was that she was exempt from every stain of guilt: *ab omni integra labe peccati* according to St. Ambrose[1]; that she was spotless and without any sin, *immaculata*, *intemerata*, *incorrupta et prorsus pudica*, *ab omni sorde et labe peccati alienissima*, as St. Ephraim expresses himself[2]; it implied an innocence and integrity exceeding by far that of all creatures, and greater

1 *Serm xxii*, in Ps. 118 n. 30 Migne P. L. vol. 15, p. 1521.

2 *Orat ad SS. Dei Genitricem*, ed. Rom. 1598, tom. 3, p. 210.

than which after God we cannot conceive: *qua maior sub Deo nequit intelligi* as St. Anselm beautifully expresses it[1].

Now let the illustrious Patriarch tell us if this idea of the sanctity and purity of the Virgin is reconcilable with original sin. How could the Christian world at all times have believed Mary to be entirely holy and acceptable to God, if we are to assume that at the moment of her conception, at least, she was opposed to Him? How could Christian antiquity declare her more pure than the angels, if it believed that the angels had been created in innocence, whilst she was conceived in the state of sin? How could it have declared her without qualification absolutely intact and full of grace, if her soul at the beginning of her existence was without grace and sanctity?

If the Patriarch desires to examine in detail the testimonies by which the Latin and Greek Fathers, commenting on Gen. iii, 15, and Luke i, 28, 42, express their common belief in this doctrine, let him examine on this subject the *Sylloge Monumentorum*, published by Ballerini,[2] or the erudite work *De Immaculato Deiparae semper Virginis Conceptu* by Passaglia.[3] There he will find a complete and well ordered digest of the testimonies of Christian antiquity in the West and East on this subject. This will convince him of two important things: 1.—That he has seriously erred in asserting that the *dogma* (that is the *definite belief*, although not its *definition*, in the theological sense) "was entirely unknown to the ancient Church;" and 2.—That they who believe that the Most Holy Virgin Mother of God was preserved from original sin must not be accused of novelty and change of faith, but that the imputation of change is due rather to those, who, having professed that doctrine at one time, and still proposing it daily in their liturgy, teach the opposite since December 8, 1854.

1 *De Conceptu Virginali*, cap. 18, Migne, P. L. vol. 158, p. 451.

2 *Sylloge Monumentorum ad Mysterium Conceptionis Immaculatae illustrandum*, Romae, 1854, typis *Civilitatis Catholicae*.

3 *De Immaculato Deiparae semper Virginis Conceptu, Commentarius*, Romae, Typis De Propaganda Fide, 1854.

In this case, as in the preceding one, it is well to repeat that the Church, the legitimate interpreter of Christian tradition, has not changed the common and ancient faith, but has confirmed and developed it ; that it has not made an addition, but only given an explanation. In other words, to use the term of Vincent of Lerins, by means of *new words* she has expressed an *ancient sentiment* of faith, in order thereby to make its meaning clearer to our understanding.

XIII.

With even less reason does the Patriarch, in the eighth paragraph of his *Encyclical*, censure as a departure from orthodox practice the manner of ablution adopted by the Church of Rome in the administration of the Sacrament of Baptism.

"The Church of the Seven Ecumenical Councils," he says, "was accustomed to baptize *by three immersions*, and even during the thirteenth century in the Western Church they baptized by three immersions. But in more recent times the Papal Church has adopted *aspersion*, an innovation which she now maintains." In reply, we ask: Was the triple immersion the *only* manner of ablution used by the Church "of the Seven Ecumenical Councils," and in using it did she consider it as the method absolutely prescribed by the Gospels for the valid administration of Baptism? If the triple immersion, although commonly adopted in early times, was not the *only* manner used by the Church and was not considered as absolutely demanded by divine revelation for the valid administration of the sacrament, then the accusation of *anti-evangelical innovation*, which the Patriarch makes against the Church of Rome for having abandoned the triple immersion, lacks all just foundation.

What, in fact, has the Church of Rome done? To conform herself to the exigencies of the times and of the changed customs of the nations without changing anything in the matter or form of the sacrament, she has substituted *infusion* for *immersion*, by pouring the water on the head of the person

to be baptized. She has, therefore, adopted *another* mode of ablution, a mode used also from the beginning of the Church and recognized as *valid* at all times and everywhere.

This is a well known historical fact, proofs of which may be found in numberless works, unknown, it appears, only to the Patriarch of Constantinople. We find records of baptism by *infusion*, such as is used at present in the Church of Rome, showing that it was one of the modes constantly followed from the first centuries, for example, in the baptism of the sick stretched on their beds who asked for baptism, and likewise when baptism was conferred upon the confessors of faith, confined in prisons. Among other witnesses of this fact we may cite St. Cyprian, who having been asked: "Quid ipsi de illis videatur qui in infirmitate et languore gratiam Dei consequuntur, an habendi sint legitimi christiani, eo quod *aqua salutari non loti sint sed perfusi*," answered: "Nos, quantam concipit mediocritas nostra, aestimamus in nullo mutilari et debilitari posse beneficia divina. . . . . . Unde apparet *aspersionem quoque aquae instar salutaris lavacri obtinere.*"[1]

In this answer St. Cyprian conforms himself to the ancient faith and to the primitive practice of the Church, recorded in the Διδαχή, "the most ancient of literary monument of Christianity after the Sacred Scriptures."[2]

Having declared that Baptism must be conferred in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost with water from a spring, the Διδαχή adds: "But if you have

1 *Ad Magnum*, Epist. 76. Migne, P. L. vol. 3, p. 1147.

2 Such Bardenhewer calls it in his *Patrologie* (Freiburg in Breisgau, Herder, 1894 p. 23) The Διδαχή was discovered by Philoteus Bryennios in 1883. The most ancient and explicit account of it was found, it appears in the Stromata I, 20 of Clement of Alexandria (Migne., P. G. vol. 8 p 817). Bryennios places the Διδαχή between 120 and 160; Funk, in the last decade of the first century; so do Zahn, Schaff and others to whom we may add Bardenhewer, (page 24.) Minasi in his erudite work published in the *Civiltà Cattolica* shows from various parts of the Διδαχή that it was written after the first Gospel and before the other three Gospels. This work was published under the title: *La dottrina del Signore pe' dodici Apostoli bandita alle genti.* (Roma, Tipografia Befani, 1891.)

no spring water, immerse in other water; and if you cannot in cold water, then in warm. And in case you have neither, *pour some water thrice on the head* in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost."[1]

This belief and this practice were never wanting in the Church. Notable is the testimony of Walafrid Strabo who wrote in the ninth century: "Notandum est *non solum mergendo, verum etiam desuper fundendo* multos baptizatos fuisse, et adhuc posse ita baptizari si necessitas sit, sicut in passione Beati Laurentii quemdam urceo allato legimus baptizatum. Hoc etiam solet evenire cum perfectiorum granditas corporum in minoribus vasibus hominem tingi non patitur.[2]" And in the thirteenth century, when, according to the Patriarch, ablution by triple immersion was in common use in the Church, St. Thomas Aquinas, making a compendium of the whole Catholic traditional doctrine, publicly taught and wrote: "Quod aqua assumitur in sacramento baptismi ad usum ablutionis corporalis per quam significatur interior ablutio peccatorum. Ablutio autem fieri potest per aquam, *non solum per modum immersionis, sed etiam per modum aspersionis vel effusionis.* Et ideo dicendum est quod *immersio non est de necessitate baptismi.*[3]"

XIV.

The illustrious Patriarch of Constantinople firmly believes that he has convinced the Pope of Rome and his Church that not only an innovation, but even a *change of faith* has taken place with regard to Baptism. He opposes to Leo XIII the incontestable authority of one of the Pontiff's illustrious predecessors in the Apostolic See of Rome. He says: *Pope Pelagius declared Baptism by triple immersion a precept of Christ:* ὁ δὲ πάπας Πελάγιος ἀποκαλεῖ διαταγὴν τοῦ Κυρίου τὴν τριττὴν κατάδυσιν.

1 *Ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἔχῃς ὕδωρ ζῶν, εἰς ἄλλο ὕδωρ βάπτισον, εἰ δ' οὐ δύνασαι ἐν ψυχρῷ ἐν θερμῷ. Ἐαν δὲ ἀμφότερα μὴ ἔχῃς, ἔχεον εἰς τὴν κεφαλὴν τρὶς ὕδωρ εἰς ὄνομα πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος.* (Cap. VII, nn. 3,4).

2 *De Rebus Ecclesiasticis*, cap. 26, Migne, P. L. vol. 114, p. 959.

3 *Summa Theologica*, P. III, quaest. 66, art. 7. Edit. Romae, 1887, p. 561.

We do not know from what source the Patriarch derives the singular ecclesiastical erudition, which he displays in his *Encyclical.* But we know that the quotation of Pope Gelasius II, although *not mutilated*, was cited in the thirteenth century by St. Thomas Aquinas, and proposed among the objections against the doctrine which he develops in the above-mentioned passage.[1] The Patriarch in all simplicity takes the *objection* made by the Holy Doctor, assuming that it is unknown to the Latins, but unfortunately he ignores the *solution* given of it *six hundred* years ago.

But the illustrious Patriarch has gone farther and fared worse. The text of Pope Pelagius, as it is cited by him, is substantially falsified. Here is the authentic text in its entirety : *Evangelicum praeceptum, ipso Domino Deo, et Salvatore nostro Jesu Christo tradente, nos admonet, in nomine Trinitatis, trina immersione sanctum baptismum unicuique tribuere.*[2] The Patriarch omits the three words *in nomine Trinitatis*[3] and thus makes us believe that the *evangelicum*

1 See *Art. VII* of the above-mentioned question, 2°. *Praeterea*, "Sacramenta ex mandato Christi efficaciam habent: sed trina immersio est ex mandato Christi : *Scribit enim Pelagius papa* Gaudentio Episcopo: *Evangelicum praeceptum*, &c.

2 *Epist. ad Gaudentium Episc.* In cap. *Multi.* Dist. 4, De Consecratione.

3 The Patriarch does not appear to have suspected the absurd consequences which must be logically admitted, if the doctrine which he maintains and which he falsely attributes to Pope Gelasius were true. If we suppose that the *evangelicum praeceptum* refers not only to the form *in nomine Trinitatis* but also to the mode *triplici immersione*, it would follow that just as the form is of divine institution so would also be the mode, and therefore just as Baptism not conferred *in nomine Trinitatis* would be invalid so would Baptism not conferred *triplici immersione* be likewise invalid. Hence not only the sick and confessors of faith of whom we have spoken above, but also millions of the faithful in the Western Church where the rites of the Eastern Churches are not observed, would have been baptized invalidly and would, therefore, be deprived of the true title of Christians ! Now the Patriarch knows well that neither the one nor the other corollary can be held ; for the former is opposed to the ancient and constant practice of the Church, the latter contradicts also the recent canons of the Oriental Churches with regard to the Baptism of the Latins. Thus, for example, the Russian Church with the Patriarch acknowledges as *orthodox*, conform-

praeceptum, of which Pope Gelasius speaks in his letter to Gaudentius, refers not to the *form* of Baptism, but rather to the *manner* in which at that time it was commonly administered. Now it is clear from the whole context that Pelagius refers the *evangelicum praeceptum* to the *form* and not to the *manner*, since he is writing against the followers of the School of Photinus, or as others will have it, of Bonosus,[4] who admitted triple immersion, but denied the necessity of administering Baptism *in nomine Trinitatis*.

If the Most Excellent Patriarch examines this doctrine, he will, we are sure, deplore, not less than we do, the grave error into which he has allowed himself to fall, perhaps by an inveterate prejudice which makes him accept, without sufficient discrimination, as true whatever seems opposed to the Church of Rome. Such errors, always indecorous and deplorable, become more so, when they are found in an authoritative and official document like the present *Patriarchal and Synodical Encyclical Letter*. The falsification just alluded to is not the only one; we have already mentioned three in the preceding paragraphs; we shall be obliged to point out others in the remaining paragraphs of our reply.

S. M. BRANDI, S.J.

(*To be continued.*)

ing itself to the canons of the Synod of Moscow in 1665, admits the validity of the Baptism of the Latins, and holds that Latins who pass from the Western to the Eastern rite, must *not be rebaptized*. See on this point the recent work *Russia and the English Church* published by Birkbeck (London, 1895,) vol. 1, p. 63.

4 See De Augustinis, *De Re Sacramentaria* Lib. I Tr. II, art. 3.

A PAGE OF CONTEMPORARY HISTORY ON BIBLICAL INSPIRATION.

ON October 16, 1895, the Rev. Brook Herford delivered in Harvard University a lecture on Liberalism and Roman Catholicism[1]. The "Dudleian Lecture" was intended by the will of Judge Paul Dudley (1750) "to be for detecting, convicting, and exposing the idolatry of the Romish Church, their tyranny, usurpations, damnable heresies, fatal errors, abominable superstitions and other crying wickedness in their high places; and finally that the Church of Rome is that mystical Babylon, that man of sin, that apostate Church, spoken of in the New Testament."

Dr. Herford did his best to apologize in behalf of this all too zealous founder, and to eulogize the Catholic Church, whose "claim is rarely understood by Protestants and but imperfectly by many of its own adherents." And afterwards, "from that calm and dispassionate standpoint which Harvard occupies to-day", as he says, he tried to give "the answer of Liberalism to the claims of the Roman Catholic Church." Of course, the name of Galileo was pronounced in the very beginning. From "the claim of infallibility in regard to that matter of Science" he was led to speak of "her decrees on the canon and inspiration of Scripture."

"The fatal mistake of Rome which is coming every year into stronger light, was when at the Fourth Session of the Council of Trent, she undertook to show that she reverenced the Bible just as much as Protestants did, by decreeing its absolute verbal inspiration. True, Protestants were affirming the same thing . . . but the Council of Trent decreed, authoritatively and finally, the divine authorship of every part of the Bible, even of what we call the Apocrypha, and this so absolutely as to make the writers simply inspired amanuenses. She thus raises up against her all the real Biblical criticism of the world, for, it is every day becoming more evident to scholars of all sects, Catholics included, that, that older claim of absolute verbal inspiration for the whole

1 An abstract of this lecture appeared in *The Christian Register* (Boston) Oct. 1895, and was reproduced in Christian Literature, Nov.—Dec. 1895.

Bible is simply contrary to fact. Catholic scholars are very quiet upon the subject, few books are published about it, and many people are quiet unaware of it; for, the chief emphasis of the Catholic appeal to the world is not the Bible, but the Church. Efforts have been made to obtain from Rome some distinct permission to give up verbal inspiration, but in vain."

Our purpose is not to write here a full refutation of these curious statements; but without any polemical spirit, and from a merely historical point of view, to give a brief account of the Catholic thought during the last few years on what is commonly called *verbal inspiration.*

It is a current opinion among many, even learned persons, that the question of verbal inspiration was settled long ago. Hence, according to them, this problem has no actual importance for thinkers of our day. And, as a consequence, the mere possibility of a writer still seriously maintaining verbal inspiration is hardly entertained.

Such would seem to be the import of the following declaration found in a recent number of "La Science Catholique," by Rev. Fr. Ermoni, a scholar of subtle metaphysical genius: "The hypothesis which is nowadays the current opinion of Exegetists is ours also. Nobody, we may say it without much exaggeration, admits in our days the verbal inspiration of Sacred Scripture." [1]

This statement, reproducing the theory current in the "Outre-Mer" circles, receives its confirmation from Rev. Fr. A. J. Maas, S. J. In one of his interesting articles on the Synoptic Problem, published in this REVIEW, not long ago, he says: "No Scripture student, unless he admit *the generally abandoned theory of verbal inspiration*, can escape the question concerning the sources of the three Evangelists." [2]

The reverend writer shows clearly that he himself does not believe in this antiquated theory, although he speaks elsewhere of "God's seemingly useless action of *inspiring* material and *expressions* in the second and third evangelist that

1 La Science Catholique, May, 1895, p. 494.

2 AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, August, 1895, p. 87.

had been inspired in the first." Another Jesuit Father, Rev. P. J. Cormican, published some months ago a paper in the *Catholic World* [Easter Number, 1895], entitled, "The Inerrency of Scripture in Light of the Encyclical Providentissimus Deus." One of the subdivisions of this article was: *Verbal inspiration.* And here again we find a condemnation of this theory which is qualified as "an error by excess." "This opinion," says the writer, "was defended to some extent in Catholic schools and was held by the first reformers. I must add in justice their successors have made amends for this bit of strictness by going to the other extreme."[1] Naturally one expects some reasons for rejecting so dangerous an opinion. And the Rev. Fr. Cormican indicates why this doctrine is *no more accepted* in Catholic schools. The proofs are, first of all, drawn from the passage of the Encyclical *Providentissimus* which requires "apt words and nothing more to convey God's message to mankind." After that, we read a full page of reasons such as are usually advanced by Catholic authors, *v. g.* Cornély,[2] Vigouroux,[3] Pesch.[4]

Since "miracles are not to be assumed without proof," these writers are afraid of "multiplying miracles without necessity," by upholding verbal inspiration. Again, they think it would necessitate charging the Holy Ghost with having committed "faults against taste, solecisms in gram-

1 Here is the latest statement of these successors: "The believers in verbal inspiration, of which some still remain, desperate as are the difficulties with which they have to contend, stand *comparatively on firm ground.* Verbal inspiration is at all events a consecrated tradition." (Goldwin Smith—Christianity's Millstone, *North American Review*, Dec., 1895, p. 719.)

2 Commentariolus de Inspiratione.

3 Manuel Biblique.

4 *Institutiones ad Sacram Theologiam*, 1894, I 1, p. 384-86. Inspiratio verbalis non requiritur . . . non plus requiritur quam ut Deus assistentia sua provideat, ut scriptor ea omnia et sola scribat, quae *secundum voluntatem* Dei scribenda sunt, et ut hoc apto et sincero modo scribantur.

And from this he deduces a consequence in the very words of Card. Franzelin: "Et hoc autem ipso *praesumi* debet, ubi non demonstratur oppositum, revera ita factum esse et Deum qui disponit omnia *suaviter*, permisisse ut homines . . . sub divina assistentia . . . *seligerent* idearum inspiratarum *signa*."—De Scriptura, p. 352.

mar,"[1] or, it would deny the personal work of the writers. Such, according to them, are the necessary consequences[2] of verbal inspiration. Moreover, how can we escape the objection taken from the contradictions met with in the Bible if the words are inspired? How "could the words of Christ be differently related by different evangelists?" Why does "the same writer, Moses, give the Decalogue which was written by God's own hand, in different words and varied style in different places?"

Alluding to these and some other arguments, the author of the "Chapters of Bible Study" could say, when exposing, at the Catholic Summer School, the usual doctrine on the subject: "There are many reasons why we need not feel bound to accept the theory of literal or verbal inspiration of the Bible, although such opinion has been advanced by eminent theologians who wished thereby to defend the integrity of the sacred volume against the wanton interference with the received text on the part of innovators, so-called religious reformers."[3]

In the Catholic University, the same opinion is held as at Woodstock College and the Summer School. In an article entitled "The Higher Criticism and the Bible,"[4] which is qualified by Fr. Cormican as of "rare merit," Dr. Ch. Grannan reproduces the classical notion of inspiration given by St. Thomas.[5] "The primary cause of the book is God, the instrumental cause is man." But he concludes—not exactly as the Angelic Doctor did—"There are, therefore, in Scripture, many accidental properties of a *purely human* origin."[6] Some pages further on he pays a tribute of praise to the

1 "*Peccata* contra grammaticam—in Spiritum sanctum velle refundere . . . in opinione verbalis inspirationis *fieri oportet.* Dicunt quidem Spiritum Sanctum in hac re se singulorum indoli accommodasse; at hoc est prorsus improbabile, quia Deus nihil agit frustra.—Pesch, p. 385.

2 "Ita scriptor secundi libri Macchabaeorum dicit—se fuisse quantum potuerit et se ex industria stilum variasse ne lectorem taedio officiat.—Ibid.

3 *Chapters of Bible Study*, p. 44.

4 *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, July, 1894.

5 Quodl. vii, art 14 ad 15um.

6 *Am. Cath. Quart. Review*, loc. cit. p. 567.

"destructive criticism," because "it did good work when it discredited the once prevalent belief in the verbal inspiration of Scripture."[1]

We must note, however, what Dr. Grannan means by the verbal inspiration so destroyed. "Every word, every syllable, every letter, every punctuation mark and every vowel point was said to have been *revealed* to the sacred penman while in a trance or ecstacy during which he committed all to writing as mechanically as a type-writer."

One thing is clear from what has been quoted thus far. To admit verbal inspiration would imply an excessive strictness, axaggerated orthodoxy and narrow-minded views[2]. Nobody, here, would consider the sacred penman merely as a type-writer.

What is felt in America, was also felt in Italy two years ago by a young Barnabite, Padre Semeria. Writing in the International magazine "*La Revue Biblique*," on the synoptic problem, he makes a vehement attack upon Mr. Ceresto and Fr. Fernandez, a Spanish theologian, because they still maintained this absolute opinion. Such stickling for antiquated doctrine rouses his indignation to so great a pitch that the famous classical "Quousque tandem" is the only expression that can describe his state of mind. However, he tries to trace the causes of this revival which, strange to say, "is not an exceptional case do-day." He suggests the following explanation: "The error consists in putting the question thus: Are the words inspired? The book is inspired. The book is, so to say, a multiple production, like the construction of a house. To ask whether the action which terminates in the whole does not act equally upon the parts is *absurd;* we might as well ask whether the architect of the house has fashioned the bricks."[3]

1 Ibid., p. 573.

2 Cf. Ubaldi: Propositio quae negat inspirationem singulorum verborum S. Scripturae a pluribus theologis recepta est, quorum numerus magis magisque in dies crevit ita ut nunc ab omnibus fere defendatur, relicta *rigidiori* illa sententia inspirationis verbalis. (Introd. in S. Script. 2, 23.)

3 Revue Biblique 1893.

So according to the learned Barnabite, if you maintain verbal inspiration, your expression is perfectly correct; if you deny it, your thought is all right. The formula: *the words are inspired* is a good one, but it does not convey the truth. You have to ask: What did God—the author of the book—have to do with the words? And the answer must be: God, the primary author of Scripture, *allowed* the writer to choose the words; but He *did not make him choose* them; otherwise we would find no imperfection at all.

Possibly, the best thing Padre Semeria did, was to point out the ambiguity of the word: verbal inspiration. Did he give the complete solution? This could be questioned. It is well to insist on the fact that the words are but a part of the inspired book, and the part must partake of the conditions of the whole.

And this is done by Dr. Schell, in the following passage: "Inspiration does not formally signify a shifting in the relations between the divine and human causality to the disadvantage of the latter, but a heightening both of the divine influence and spontaneous activity. Materially it extends as far as the human authorship, including the *will*, the plan or *thought*, and the execution or *words*; for these three activities are not only synchronous, but conditional, and influence each other mutually, so that no one or no two of them would suffice as the sole vehicle of Inspiration. In all limiting schemes the spontaneous share of the sacred writer falls short of the origination which we find in other writers, whilst God on His part cannot be said fully to speak to us.[1]

After the Italian and German exegetists, let us hear what the prominent biblical scholar, Abbé Loisy, replies to Padre Semeria, in his unfortunately discontinued magazine *L'Enseignement biblique*. Logical, clear, even "piquant" is the

1 Schell: Dogmatik, I, 103-104.—Let us compare this evident reason with the refined terminology of Fr. Pesch: "Scriptura per versionem accidenta liter tantum mutata est, manet autem essentialiter Scriptura. Scriptura autem praecise ut Scriptura Spiritui Sancto adscribitur; ergo (?) non secundum accidentia verborum et styli.—Loc. cit. p. 386.

answer: "Yes, Reverend Father, you are perfectly right. Quousque tandem? How long will theologians quarrel over words? How long will they make so copious a use of exclamation points? How long will they call one another "fogies" (that is about what you say to Fr. Fernandez) or "heretics" (that is what Fernandez will reply to you)? How long will they speak at random of the inspiration of the Scripture, and bring it into questions with which it has no concern? This will likely keep up for yet a long time. It would be well if some of us were to agree to give a better example. A mutual understanding, as to the point at issue and a precise knowledge of what the man whom you take to be your adversary really holds—this will be a very useful precaution which would put an end to many controversies. Coarse words are always disagreeable. So, Reverend Father, I fancy I see you smile, and am almost ashamed to confess it, but all the same . . . . . *I admit verbal inspiration* and the perversity of my mind goes even to the length of finding that the modern opinion, that of the "remarkable men" whom you quote, and your own, is less just, less rational, less worthy of God and of man, even less broad—be not angry if I say it—than the opinion of the ancients. I could never understand how the Sacred Books were inspired as to the substance and not as to the form; how, the ideas being furnished to the sacred writer by inspiration, he had only to cast about for words. True it is, I do not understand any better how the ideas expressed by the inspired author cannot but belong to him. They have become his *own* since he expresses them.

"The ancient tradition down to Suarez[1] is rather favor-

1 Fr. Pesch denies the fact in the following manner: Nonnulli inter scholasticos specie tenus tantum statuunt inspirationem verbalem, sed rem ita explicant ut a nostra sententia non recedant. Ita Suarez: "Est Scriptura instinctu Spiritus Sancti scripta dictantis non tantum sensum sed etiam verba." Nihilominus ait: quando auctor canonicus scribit aliquid quod secundum se humanum est, . . . satis videtur, quod Spiritus Sanctus . . . custodiat . . . ab omnibus verbis quae non expediunt vel decent.—Loc. cit. p. 386.

able to verbal inspiration. Why has it begun to be abandoned? It seems to me—I make the suggestion with reserve—it seems to me that for the Vulgate the same inspiration was desired as for the original texts of Scripture; once verbal inspiration is done away with, a version may be as divine as the primitive book. The Bible, so to speak, only changed its cover. Do you take this to be a happy solution? Is this admission necessary or even useful? The aim of the Bible's inspiration is obtained as perfectly by the version as by the original: and no other reason is necessary to make the use of the Vulgate legitimate. Granted that the sacred writers were inspired not only as to the thought of writing, but also for the execution of this thought, then, your theory which excludes verbal inspiration seems less tenable from a psychological point of view. Nor do I see that any serious difficulty presents itself. It serves, we are told, to explain the individuality of the style. Just as if this individuality did not pertain as well to the thought as to the style! As if grace overthrew nature! I grant willingly that the partisans of verbal inspiration have often confounded inspiration with revelation, conceiving both as something quite mechanical; but I believe, too, that the upholders of limited inspiration have fallen into the same confusion. Both the one and the other seems always to look upon the inspired writers as automatons, and their writings as simply the mechanical results of their pens, without any trouble of thought on the part of the authors."[1]

The Abbé Loisy had previously endorsed the opinion of P. Dausch in the following manner: "The Bible contains both a divine and human element. But these two elements are so intimately connected that they constitute a work in which it is impossible to distinguish what is due exclusively to human agency from what is exclusively divine. These two agencies have acted *per modum unius* as the scholastics say. The inspired book is all of it the work of God, but it is at the same time no less the work of man. God is its

1 Enseignement biblique, 1893, n°. 8.

primary, while man is its secondary author, subordinate to God. To say that God is the author of the ideas and man the author of the words, that we are indebted to God for the substance and to man for the form; that God is the author of the passages bearing on faith or morals, and man the author of the historical parts, or merely of the 'obiter dicta;' to do this is, according to Mr. Dausch, to practice '*vivisection.*' Both God and man have (but in a widely different manner) a right to be called authors of the Bible in its entirety—of its ideas and words—substance and form, religious truths and historical or cosmological data. Neither ancient tradition, properly interpreted, nor reason, sanction the divisions which modern writers under the influence of polemical bias, have tried to effect in the Bible. The composition of the Sacred Books has been a supernatural work which the divine concursus has penetrated through and through so that not a wit of it can be said to be due exclusively either to God or man.'"[1]

Abbé Loisy's doctrine is not an isolated exception. In 1892 a valuable contribution to Apologetics was given by a Dominican, Fr. de Groot, who is now Rector of the State University of Holland. He attempted to give an Apologetic Summa *De Ecclesia*, according to St. Thomas. Now, when treating the question of verbal inspiration, every one feels that the learned Dominican is likely to be overwhelmed by the torrent of modern theologians who evidently do not wish to support this error of the ancients. However, the fervent disciple of St. Thomas does not see clearly that the Angelic Doctor supports their theory of non-verbal inspiration; he but modestly says: others are qualified to end this question; but the verbal inspiration system was the opinion of our ancient doctors, and really the recent theologians who follow the opposite opinion do not give any satisfactory reply to the reasons advanced for the former theory. The proofs which the latter give are more specious than solid.'"[2] And then

1 L'Enseignement biblique, 1892. Histoire du dogme de l'inspiration. *Reprint.* Les Etudes Bibliques, 1894, p. 69.

2 De Groot: Summa Apologetica de Ecclesia, II p. 206.

the Reverened Dominican appends a very good refutation thereof.[1]

A few month ago, a member of the same Order had in the new but already famous magazine *La Revue Thomiste* a thorough exposition and commentary on the definition of inspiration as set forth by St. Thomas.[2] Perhaps the author of the article has an over-weening confidence in the sufficiency of St. Thomas to clear up all modern problems, as well as in the virtue of some material and old-fashioned comparisons unsuited for disentangling psychological and supernatural phenomena. This does, however, in no way affect the legitimacy of the conclusion which the writer deduces from the Thomistic notion of inspiration. "Why," he asks, "do you make a distinction between verbal and non-verbal inspiration, between inspiration of the substance and inspiration of the words? In this way you separate some of the elements of Scripture from God's action, some from the writer's action. Nothing in the Scripture has remained uninfluenced by the action of God, even the material and physical act of writing."

The usual cause of this error appeared quite evident to the young writer. "Almost always," says he, "theologians seem to have reduced the rôle of God in the composition of the Scriptures to a previous action whose result was to give to the sacred penman the thoughts or the words which he used afterwards in his book." That such a conception is erroneous both by *excess* and *defect* must become evident after some reflection.

1 Inspirationem ad *omnia et singula etiam verba* extendi contra recentiores non paucos multi veteres docent. Veterum illa assertio ex eo certe impugnari nequit. 1°. Quod sit magna in variis Libris styli diversitas. Divinitus scilicet influxus sacrorum auctorum indoli sese accomodat, quemadmodum Deus generatim causas creatas secundum naturam earum capacitatemque movet. 2°. Posita inspiratione verbali non sequitur ut versiones jam S. Scriptura vocari nequeant. Namque verba originalium, in alium sermonem conversa, modo versio sincera sit, non nisi materialiter mutari videantur. (*Ibid.*)

1 Une pensée de St. Thomas sur l'inspiration scripturaire—by Fr. Pégues, O. P.

No one denies that to neglect the distinction between revelation and inspiration is certainly "*an error of excess*." But unfortunately this confusion is very prevalent. Recently Fr. E. Lévèque, professor of exegesis at St. Sulpice, in Paris, writing a criticism of Rev. Fr. Brucker's, S. J. *Questions actuelles d'Ecriture Sainte*, took occasion from the chapter on Inspiration to explain his own view on our subject in the following words: "Inspiration is a help given to convey truth. It is not given to know, to receive, but to transmit. On the contrary, in Revelation, the mind is passive, so that it may receive a manifestation of truth; while with Inspiration the mind is active. For example, the prophets frequently received revelations of the future, and either then or afterwards committed such revelations to writing. But this revelation was never an element of inspiration. Inspiration was ever the action of God upon the penman, guiding his mind, without dispensing with his personal work, as in ordinary composition. There was only one difference, but that a capital one: all these operations were moved and directed by God who knows how to operate on a free instrument without taking away its liberty or its personal characteristics."[1]

Such confusion involves something more than a question of words.[2] It is easy now to explain how the idea of a *revelation* of each word—so-called *verbal inspiration*—was rejected by Dr. Grannan. The conception of it, taken to mean this, disfigures the nature of inspiration, for God would not be the principal, but the exclusive author of Scripture.

And what are the consequences of this confusion? Our Protestant friends will answer: "During the last six years (1871-77) . . . I have heard not less than one hundred addresses made by unbelievers. . . . Taking their objections as a whole, I feel convinced that two kinds at least of them

1 *Revue Biblique*, July, 1895, p. 421-422.

2 "If any one likes to talk of verbal inspiration, if that phrase conveys some substantial meaning to his mind, by all means let him keep it. He cannot go further than I should . . . in denouncing the *unreasonable* notion that thoughts and words can be separated, that the life which is in one must not penetrate the other." (F. D. Maurice, Theological Essays—quoted by *The Thinker* June, 1895, p. 526.)

owe their entire plausibility to their *identification* of that particular form of inspiration which is *usually designated as verbal or mechanical*, with a Divine Revelation."[1]

At the same time this conception is "*an error by defect*," because from another point of view Inspiration—which does not require a revelation—implies something more than Revelation. St. Teresa, for instance, received some revelations; but she was not inspired to write the visions she enjoyed; and no divine help was given her to convey these revelations to paper. If inspiration were a mere revelation, this only would follow: The sacred writers *received* divine thoughts. But we would not have divine Scriptures, because we could not know whether they relate truly and without any change or adulteration the message as they received it from God. A revelation comes always from God, and never supposes a personal work in him who received it; but this manifestation of truth is not destined necessarily to be communicated. Inspiration is a motion from God, which directs the writer to express what God wants, and nothing more; but nothing less. Therefore there is no single element which is withdrawn from the action of God; *especially words*, which by their very nature are to express thoughts.

So we cannot help wondering at the vain efforts of the Anglican divines, when they try to acquit their theologians of having "imposed upon men such burden too grievous to be borne" as mechanical dictation. Nor do we understand their indignation against "the well-known American secularist Colonel Robert Ingersoll, who said: "If the words are not inspired, what is?"[2] Really, "if the words are not inspired, what is?"

The latest essay bearing on the subject appeared in *La Revue Biblique*,[3] where Fr. Lagrange, O. P., the president of the

1 Prebendary Row, Bampton Lectures, 1878.

2 Rev. E. Harding. *The Thinker*, June, 1895, p. 523.

3 October, 1895, p. 563. At the same date, in the *Dublin Review*, Baron von Hügel, in his last article on *The Church and the Bible*, agrees fully with Dr. Loisy; and he sums up the actual opinion in these words: "Inspiration is omnipresent," p. 292.

Biblical School of Jerusalem, and the chief editor of its international magazine, strongly opposes the non-verbal inspiration theory as "an administrative compromise, a kind of *congruism*, but not at all a theological distinction." He insists that "such a theory is modern," and, tracing its origin, he says: "This theory was created by men who, wrongly imagining inspiration to be a mechanical pressure, attempted to resolve some difficulties in referring to the writer *at least* the choice of words. So they came to the strange conception that the sacred penman received passively all the thoughts but became entirely active—'a total cause'—when it was a question of choosing expressions." And the prudent Dominican points out a dangerous but necessary deduction from such a theory: "If its arguments were good at all, they would *deny the inspiration of thoughts, when not necessarily revealed.*"

Really, I do not see how they can escape this conclusion, and I feel confident that each reader will realize the strength of the following words of Fr. Lagrange: "Once more it will be demonstrated that modern studies but come to re-establish some ancient systems on a more scientific basis. The science of apologetics will have nothing to suffer from this; on the contrary, it will feel more comfortable in the large edifices of traditional theology, than in the modern halls, hastily built up, as a provisional refuge by Cardinal Franzelin."

The "provisional refuge" was good for a while. Its *rôle* had been certainly useful. Now the absurd idea of mechanical pressure can no longer be admitted. The Protestants confess this openly. "At a certain moment certain situations seem untenable, certain modes of speech are suddenly confessed to be obsolete, ... the sin of usury as interest for money, . . . or *verbal inspiration;* slavery, torture, etc., are at last widely admitted to be untrue, unjust, barbarous, or urgently requiring some modification." [1]

Both higher criticism and this particular doctrine of some Catholic theologians have killed this so-called verbal inspira-

1 *Contemporary Review* October, 1895. The new Clergy, by H. R. Haweis.

tion. No name was more improper, since, first of all, it was not an *inspiration*, but a mechanical dictation; nor is the word *verbal* apt to convey the idea that even vowel points were dictated.[1] "Hypnotic type-writing" would be far more suitable, as a modern expression, for this antiquated idea.

And so confusion would be avoided. No one would interpret the "*Lingua mea calamus scribae velociter scribentis*" as describing the condition of the Psalmist under inspiration. No one would defend this mechanical theory. On the other hand, no one would be longer deceived by the word *verbal inspiration* and attempt to withdraw anything from the divine action.

So misunderstandings would be prevented and subtle arguments would no longer be directed against imaginary opponents. All the difficulties would not be settled *ipso facto*. For, it is question of a psychological, supernatural action. And it is not an easy matter to understand how God can act upon an instrument such as man, who by his nature is free, so that everything in Scripture comes from God, everything from man. Here is involved that profound question, the *divine concursus*, one pregnant of mysteries. The difficulty would be in some measure diminished, had we in all nature any analogy of such a powerful, yet delicate action. To the Infinite Being, and to Him alone, does it belong so to influence a second cause, whilst at the same time respecting his precious boon of liberty. Neither do we, on our part, understand how we act freely under a necessary and efficacious impulse given by God; still we cannot deny either our liberty, or the almighty action of the Creator. As an adjunct

1 Nowadays everyone knows that the Hebrew Old Testament was written purely in consonants without vowels, these were added in the VIth or VIIth century A. D. This was first made out by the French Calvinist, L. Cappellus, in 1624. But the set of opinion throughout the reformed Churches was so strong that a later work by Cappellus could only be published (1650) by the help of his son, who had joined the Church of Rome.—Sundry Oracles of God, 1891, p, 20–21. For details see Bernus. Richard Simon—La critique biblique au siècle de Louis XIV, 1869, p. 61–62. These would have been useful readings for both Judge Dudley and Dr. B. Herford.

to the study of inspiration, the study of the controversy concerning premotion and concursus would be of some value.

It seems, then, that the question of verbal inspiration is not rejected *universally*. Exegetists of undoubted authority in the biblical world deduce this theory either by the scholastic treatment of the Catholic doctrine, or from historical and patristic studies. These men, however, do not conceive it as distorted by some modern theologians under Protestant influences; but as exposed by the solemn and authorized voice of Catholic Tradition. Such a conception as theirs carries with it weight not alone by reason of its tradition, but also by its soundness and philosophical profundity. They see its naturalness. It is not repugnant either on the part of Providence with its gentle action, respecting in man his nature and faculties, never destroying, but elevating and conserving in the admirable unity of religious purpose, the beautiful variety of human genius—*fortiter et suaviter.*

At the end of the century, it is our privilege to welcome an evolution on this point. It is gratifying to see that the most recent opinion turns out to be but the teaching of the Fathers. Some few centuries past, this teaching was obscured and narrowed. Would it be inexact to point out as one of the causes the lack in the men of those times of exegetical knowledge? It is necessary, indeed, for a professor of Scripture to be a theologian. But would it be to misinterpret the spirit of the Encyclical "Providentissimus Deus," to say that in questions of Biblical theology, only those authors should be taken into serious account who have made a deep and thorough study of the traditional doctrine of the Church together with the criticism of the Sacred Books?

JOSEPH BRUNEAU, SS.

Baltimore, St. Mary's Seminary.

ANALECTA.

SUMMARY OF DECREES REGARDING THE EXPOSITION OF THE M. BL. SACRAMENT.[1]

Permission of the Ordinary.

Illud in primis certissimum est, in quibuscumque Ecclesiis, etiam privilegio immunibus, sive Saecularibus sive Regularibus, non licere exponi publice divinam Eucharistiam, nisi causa publica et Episcopi facultas intervenerit; solius autem Episcopi partes esse, ut causae publicae meritum expendat ac declaret.[2]

Confraternitates, vigore aggregationis cuicumque Archi-confraternitati, non possunt exponere SS. Sacramentum sine licentia Ordinarii:[3] cum sola autem licentia Ordinarii possunt, etiam renuente et contradicente Parocho.[4] SS. vero Sacramenti Expositio in Ecclesiis Confraternitatum laicalium permitti potest ab Episcopo pro sua prudentia; sed non item eiusdem Sacramenti retentio.[5]

An dicta Expositio in Ecclesiis non parochialibus, illis diebus quibus fit Expositio in Ecclesia parochiali, fieri possit, arbitrio Ordinarii remittitur.[6]

On Various Feast Days.

Retineri potest inveterata consuetudo exponendi per totam diem SS. Sacramentum in iis solemnitatibus, quae scopum habent sive mysterium aliud ab Eucharistia, sicut festum B. M. V. aut alicuius Sancti.[7]

Servari potest consuetudo, quod, expleto Officio vespertino in die Commemorationis omnium fidelium Defunctorum, et etiam per subsequentem ocatvam, benedicatur populo cum SS. Sacramento.[8]

1 Adone: Synopsis Canonico-Liturgica.
2 Benedictus XIV, Const. *Accepimus.*
3 S. C. Rit. Decr. 13 Septembr, 1642.
4 S. C. Rit. Decr. 18 Martii, 1679.
5 S. C. Rit. Decr. 22 Septembr, 1703.
6 S. C. Conc. Decr. 16 Maii, 1705.
7 S. C. Rit. Decr. 1 Octobr, 1864.
8 S. C. Rit. Decr. 11 Augusti, 1853.

Exposition at the Side Altar.

Non prohibetur quominus SS. Sacramentum, si opus sit, exponatur in aliquo Altari laterali.[1]

The Ostensorium.

Quum agatur de SS. Eucharistia in Ostensorio exponendo, non decet sacras Species inter vitreas laminas includere, quarum superficies illas immediate tangant.[2]

Non licet in Expositione SS. Sacramenti lumen aliquod eo artificio collocare e parte postica Ostensorii, ut directe illuceat in ipsam Sacratissimam Hostiam, quae exinde lucida appareat.[3]

Quum a Secretario S. R. C. proposita fuerit petitio artificis Ioseph Rua "utrum admitti possit usus cuiusdam machinae ab ipso constructae, cuius ope elevaretur ac deponeretur Ostensorium, dum salutaris Hostia populo adoranda exponitur;" Emi et Revmi Patres, re accurate perpensa, unanimi suffragio responderunt, *Negative.*[4]

Consuetudo exponendi SS. Sacramentum, praevio quodam machinismo ad hoc specialiter constructo, vel in manu alicuius Statuae B. M. V., vel iuxta latus vulneratum sculptae Imaginis D. N. I. C. e Cruce pendentis, est omnino abolenda: siquidem Instructio Clementina iubet Statuas non esse apponendas in Altari, in quo SS. Sacramentum est expositum, et Sacramentum ipsum exponendum esse sub Throno eminentiori in loco; quae praescriptiones consetudini expositae sunt omnino contrariae.[5]

Reprobatur item pulvini usus sub Ostensorio alicubi inductus in SS. Sacramenti expositione.[6]

Indulgenced Prayers.

In plurimis Dioecesibus recitari solent coram SS. Sacramento exposito vulgari sermone quaedam laudes, quibus adnexae sunt nonnullae Indulgentiae, *Dio sia benedetto* etc. Quum autem in aliquibus Ecclesiis dictae laudes recitentur immediate post Orationem, *Deus, qui nobis sub Sacramento mirabili*, etc., antequam

1 S. C. Rit. Decr. 21 Aprilis, 1873.
2 S. C. Rit. Decr. 4 Februarii, 1871.
3 S. C. Rit. Decr. 3 Aprilis, 1821.
4 S. C. Rit. Decr. 7 Iulii, 1877.
5 S. C. Rit. Decr. 23 Aprilis, 1875.
6 S. C. Rit. Decr. 31 Augusti, 1867.

impertiatur populo Benedictio, in aliis vero post Benedictionem cum Venerabili, sed priusquam reponatur SS. Sacramentum in Tabernaculo; utraque consuetudo potest ad libitum continuari.[1]

Suffrages for the Dead.

Toleranda est consuetudo, si adsit, recitandi in expositione SS. Sacramenti Orationes pro defuncto vel defunctis.[2]

In actu Benedictionis cum SS. Sacramento populo elargiendae, quando illud exponitur in suffragium fidelium Defunctorum, Sacerdos utatur Stola et Pluviali coloris albi, et non nigri.[3] Post expositum Sacramentum, Pallium et Conopaeum item colore albo esse debent, et nunquam colore nigro utendum in Expositione et Processione Sacramenti.[4] Hinc non licet Expositionem Sacramenti facere in Missa et Officio Defunctorum, cum apparatu nigri coloris, neque illud exponere cum paramentis nigris, et in Processione deferre cum vexillis nigri coloris.[5]

The Color.

Pallium coloris rubri retineri nequit in Altari, in quo exponitur SS. Sacramentum Dominica Pentecostes et duabus sequentibus Feriis, quum obstent Decreta.[6] In festis SS. Eucharistiae Sacramenti nullo modo potest celebrari cum paramentis rubeis, sed tantum in paramentis albis, juxta ritum Romanum, quibuscumque in contrarium non obstantibus.[7]

Occasione concionum, utendum est colore albo quoad exedron, seu cathedram, in SS. Sacramenti Expositione.[8]

The Light.

Luminum quantitas pietati facientis Expositionem est remittenda; et in Altari super candelabris ad minus sex candelae accensae sunt retinendae.[9]

1 S. C. Rit. Decr. 11 Martii 1871.
2 S. C. Rit. Decr. 16 Decembr, 1828.
3 S. C. Rit. Decr. 7 Iunii, 1681.
4 S. C. Rit. Decr. 9 Iulii, 1678.
5 S. C. Rit. Decr. 10 Februarii, 1685.
6 S. C. Rit. Decr. 19 Decembr, 1829.
7 S. C. Rit. Decr. 23 Ianuarii, 1683.
8 S. C. Rit. Decr. 9 Aprilis, 1808.
9 S. C. Rit. Decr. 15 Martii, 1698.

In expositione SS. Sacramenti, etiam in casu deficientiae redituum, lumina *ad olio* nullatenus substitui possunt luminibus cereis.[1]

The Deacon.

In exponendo tantum et recondendo SS. Sacramento extra Missam, Diaconus solus potest vicem gerere Sacerdotis.[2]

In SS. Sacramenti Expositone vel Repositione, Diaconus, sive alter qui illud ex Altari defert ad Thronum, vel e Throno ad Altare, non adhibeat velum humerale nec umbellam, licet accedendum sit post Altare;[3] si vero diverso in Altari exstet Tabernaculum, seu Thronus, velum humerale est adhibendum.[4]

The Bishop.

Quum SS. Sacramentum in Ara maiori Cathedralis Ecclesiae publice solemniterque exponitur, removendum non est Baldachinum de Throno Episcopali, sed retineri potest ad ornamentum Ecclesiae.[5]

In Expositione SS. Sacramenti, Praesente Episcopo genuflexo, Celebrans, dum pervenit ad Altare, nullam ei debet reverentiam praestare; nec dum ascendit ad impertiendam populo Benedictionem, facultatem cum actu obsequii eodem petere.[6]

In Benedictione SS. Sacramenti, Episcopus praesens imponere debet thus in thuribulo, atque ipsemet thurificare,[7] quatenus assistat saltem Cappa indutus: sin minus, id pertinet ad Celebrantem.[8]

Episcopo non licet dare Benedictionem cum SS. Sacramento, assumptis Chyrothecis loco Veli humeralis: Chyrothecis autem in huiusmodi functione uti non debet.[9]

Episcopus, in impertienda populo Benedictione cum SS. Sacramento, decantare non debet, *Sit Nomen Domini benedictum*, quin valeat contraria consuetudo.[10]

1 S. C. Rit. Decr. 27 Ianurii, 1868.
2 S. C. Rit. Decr. 11 Septembr, 1847.
3 S. C. Rit. Decr. 7 Decembr, 1844.
4 S. C. Rit. Decr. 16 Decembr, 1828.
5 S. C. Rit. Decr. 19 Iunii, 1875.
6 S. C. Rit. Decr. 27 Februarii, 1847.
7 S. C. Rit. Decr. 21 Iulli, 1855.
8 S. C. Rit. Decr. 31 Martii. 1703.
9 S. C. Rit. Decr. 21 Iulii, 1855.
10 S. R. C. Decr. 21 Jul, 1855.

SS. Sacramento adorationi exposito, potest Episcopus cauda uti, quatenus solemniter celebret.[1]

The Preacher.

Nullo modo convenit ut caput tegant Concionatores, quando praedicant vel sermonem habent in Ecclesia, ubi super Altare SS. Sacramentum in Tabernaculo crystallino publice, ut a Christi-fidelibus veneretur et adoretur, exponitur, prout fieri solet infra octavam festivitatis Corporis Christi, et quando per annum Oratio continua quadraginta horarum indicitur ; sed ipsi semper capite detecto, dum concionem habent coram SS. Sacramento, stare debent,[2] licet SS, Sacramentum sit velo serico obductum.[3]

Covering the Altar Picture.

Quum SS. Sacramentum exponitur, solum tegenda est Imago quae exstat in Altari, in quo fit Expositio.[4]

Statues.

Non est toleranda consuetudo exponendi Sacram Imaginem Iesu Infantis super Altare, in quo fidelium venerationi SS. Sacramentum exponitur ; sed exponi poterit Imago divini Infantis in alio Altari.[5]

Relics.

In Ecclesiis, ubi alicuius Sancti Reliquia sit exposita, exponi nequit sacra Pyxis per breve temporis spatium, ad recitandas nonnullas preces quae cum Benedictione SS. Sacramenti absolvuntur, non remota eadem Reliquia.[6]

Private Exposition.

In Expositionibus minus solemnibus non est collocanda in Throno sacra Pyxis, contraria consuetudine non obstante.[7]

Eucharistiae Tabernaculum solum aperiatur, et sacra Pyxis clausa

1 S. C. Rit. Decr. 18 Augusti, 1877.
2 S. C. Rit. Decr. 28 Aprilis, 1607.
3 S. C. Rit. Decr. 22 Septembr, 1837.
4 S. C. Rit. Decr. 11 Martii, 1871.
5 S. C. Rit. Decr. 7 Februarii, 1874.
6 S. C. Rit. Decr. 19 Maii, 1838.
7 S. C. Rit. Decr. 23 Maii, 1835.

suoque velamine obtecta populi oculis obiiciatur. Verum penitus interdicitur sacram Pyxidem extra Tabernaculum efferri, ac velatam sub umbella collocari, quum nullum huius ritus vestigium apud scriptores, nullaque Sedis Apostolicae consuetudo deprehendatur, quam sequi omnino debemus.[1] Genuflexiones autem utroque genu sunt faciendae a transeuntibus ante SS. Sacramentum, etiamsi fuerit in Pyxide patenter expositum.[2]

Amplexa est Ecclesia pium usum exponendi Venerabile Sacramentum omnibus conspicuum, utpote duobus crystallis inclusum in Ostensorio, dummodo id de licentia Ordinarii, publicamque ob causam aliquam fiat. Adiecit et illud Ecclesia, quod si privata tantum, non autem publica causa subsit, Sacramentum exponatur; ita tanem ut, reserato Tabernaculo, inde Sacrum Christi Corpus minime educatur, sed vel sacra Pyxide sit inclusum, aut velo obtectum, ita ut videri non possit. Casum denique prospexit Ecclesia instantis alicuius nimbi, procellae alteriusve ingentis periculi, cavitque ut, si populus excitari velit ad Deum Optimum Maximum deprecandum, quo ab ingruenti malo praestetur immunis, adaperiatur Tabernaculum, minime educto Sacramento; sed ante ipsum sacra Pyxide inclusum, preces religioso affectu recitentur. Si autem Sacramentum non debet e Tabernaculo educi, facile intelligitur, in designatis casibus non esse illud afferendum ad Ecclesiae ianuam, nec cum eodem Benedictionem impertiendam.[3]

Quum nimbi, procellae, turbines aut grandines impendent, ne Sacerdos, ad tempestatis procellam arcendam, Vasculum adhibeat, in quo SS. Eucharistiae Sacramentum asservatur; sed Tabernaculum, ubi illud in Altari reconditur, patefaciat licet, tumque in eius conspectu Litanias aliasque religiosas preces, eius rei causa institutas, pie sancteque pronunciet.[4]

Si quandocumque privata ex causa Sacrosancta Eucharistia exponenda videbitur, e Tabernaculo nunquam extrahatur, sed in Pyxide velata, in aperto eiusdem Tabernaculi ostiolo, cum assistentia alicuius Sacerdotis Stola et Superpelliceo induti, et cum sex saltem luminibus cereis, collocetur: quod idem in Ecclesiis Regularium servari mandatur.[5]

1 S. C. Rit. Decr. 16 Martii, 1876.
2 S. C. Rit. Decr. 7 Maii, 1746.
3 Benedictus XIV, Const. *Quum, ut recte nosti. Synopsis canonico-liturgica.*
4 Conc. Mediolan. III.
5 S. C. Ep. et Reg. Decr. 9 Decembr, 1602.

Generatim permittendus non est usus palam exponendi SS. Sacramentum antequam lllucescat aurora, et illud reponendi tempore nocturno.[1]

Canon Tablets Removed.

In expositione SS. Sacramenti, sive pro Oratione quadraginta Horarum, sive alia quavis de causa, amovendae omnino sunt tres tabellae ab Altari Expositionis, quas Rubricae ad Celebrantis commoditatem exigunt in Missae celebratione.[2]

Collections.

Sustineri potest praxis pias pecuniae collectiones agendi in Ecclesiis, in quibus SS. Sacramentum est publicae adorationi expositum, iuxta tamen Ecclesiae ianuam, et absque rumore.[3]

Sitting.

Secluso scandalo aut irreverentia, tolerari potest consuetudo, quod Clerus et populus, dum Sacramentum expositum manet, sedeant.[4]

Blessing with Pyxis.

Quoties nil inconveniens deprehendat Revmus Ordinarius, permittat continuationem consuetudinis dimittendi populum fidelem cum Benedictione SS. Sacramenti in sacra Pyxide occlusi, ac in festis cum Ostensorio.[5]

Vestments.

Nequent Canonici Benedictionem cum SS. Sacramento populo impertiri, simplici Stola imposita super habitu canonicali;[6] neque Episcopus ipse id potest, non obstante immemorabili suae Cathedralis consuetudine:[7] Canonicus autem, Officium faciens in Expositione vel in Repositione SS. Sacramenti, assumere debet Pluviale vel super Rocchetto et Cotta, vel super Rocchetto et Alba.[8]

In benedicendo populo cum sacra Pyxide, extremitatibus Veli

1 S. C. Rit. Decr. 1 Octobr, 1864.
2 S. C. Rit. Decr. 20 Decembr, 1865.
3 S. C. Rit. Decr. 31 Augusti, 1867.
4 S. C. Rit. Decr. 38 Iulii, 1876.
5 S. C. Rit. Decr. 16 Martii, 1876.
6 S. C. Rit. Decr. 23 Ianuarii, 1700.
7 S. C. Rit. Decr. 29 Martii, 1851.
8 S. C. Rit. Decr. 25 Septembr., 1852.

oblongi humeralis illa tota cooperiri debet;[1] neque tolerari potest consuetudo benedicendi populum cum Pyxide, parvo conopeo contecto, absque usu Veli humeralis.[2]

In Benedictionibus, quae dantur sive cum SS. Sacramento sive cum Ligno SS. Crucis, Sacerdos uti potest supra Rocchettum, si eius habeat usum, Amictu, Stola et Pluviali, si Ministri sacri parati non adsint: secus, negative.[3]

Incensing.

Sacerdos, dum in Expositione SS. Sacramenti incensum ponit in thuribulo, stare debet: ab eodem vero SS. Eucharistiae Sacramentum thurificandum est triplici tantum ductu, sed genibus flexis, et tam ante quam post incensationem profunda facta capitis inclinatione.[4]

Quod Thuriferarius incenset SS. Sacramentum in actu Benedictionis, uti fit in Elevatione eiusdem SS. Sacramenti in Missa solemni, non praescribitur,[5] et servanda est consuetudo locorum.[6]

Omissio incensationis conformior est Ecclesiae praxi in Benedictione cum sacra Pyxide: requiritur tamen omnino, quum impertitur Benedictio cum Ostensorio.[7]

Chanting.

In Ecclesiis, in quibus invaluit consuetudo canendi ante Benedictionem SS. Sacramenti alteram ex Antiphonis finalibus divini Officii de tempore occurrente, nempe *Ave Regina Coelorum*, *Regina Coeli*, *Salve Regina*, *Alma Redemptoris*, *Antiphonae* praedictae cantentur immediate post Litanias, cum Oratione de B. M. V. congruente: si vero non cantentur Litaniae, praemittantur eaedem Antiphonae Hymno *Tantum ergo*.[8]

Cantatis Versiculis *Panem de Coelo*, etc., Sacerdos benedicturus insurgens, reiterare non debet genuflexionem antequam recitet Orationes.[9]

1 S. C. Rit. Decr. 23 Februarii, 1839.
2 S. C. Rit. Decr. 13 Iulii, 1883.
3 S. C. Rit. Decr. 20 Martii, 1869.
4 S. C. Rit. Decr. 26 Martii, 1859.
5 S. C. Rit. Decr. 11 Septembr., 1847.
6 S. C. Rit. Decr. 7 Septembr., 1861.
7 S. C. Rit. Decr. 11 Septembr., 1847.
8 S. C. Rit. Decr. 23 Martii, 1881.
9 S. C. Rit. Decr. 2 Augusti, 1698.

Servanda est dispositio Caeremon, Episcopor. l. 2 c. 33, ubi nulla fit mentio de Versu *Dominus Vobiscum;* sed iubetur tantum, post *Panem de Coelo* etc. et R. *Omne delectamentum* etc. cantari Orationem. Et sic servat in Urbe SS. Dominus Noster, et observetur ab omnibus, quidquid alii in contrarium asserant.[1]

In benedicendo populum cum SS. Sacramento, Celebrans nihil dicere, cantores et musici nihil quoque canere interim debent, ad praescriptum Ritualis Romani et Caeremonialis Episcoporum, non obstante quacumque contraria consuetudine.[2] Peracta vero Benedictione, permitti potest cantus alicuius Versiculi, etiam vernacula lingua concepti.[3]

Orations.

Oratio, *Deus, qui nobis sub Sacramento mirabili* etc., concludi debet uti in ultima editione Ritualis Romani anni 1874,[4] scilicet per verba *Qui vivis et regnas in saecula saeculorum*, non, *per omnia saecula saeculorum*.[5]

In Oratione quadraginta horarum et duplicibus primae et secundae classis, quum populo benedicitur, addi potest aliqua Collecta : negative vero in festo et per octavam SS. Corporis Christi.[6]

Quando in Benedictionibus cum SS. Sacramento plures dicuntur Orationes, in conclusione servandae sunt Rubricae :[7] conclusio autem debet esse brevis, et concordare cum ultima Oratione, iuxta Rubricas.[8]

Benedictio cum SS. Sacramento impertienda est, expletis Hymno *Pange lingua* et Oratione, non quando cantatur Versus, *Sit et benedictio :* contraria consuetudo non est servanda.[9]

Confraternities.

Quum Clerus in aliqua Confraternitate e Sacristia procedit ad Altare ad exponendum SS. Sacramentum, possunt Sodales, laici se Clericis cum luminaribus sociare ; sed procedere debent ante Clerum.[10]

1 S. C. Rit. Decr. 16 iunii, 1663.
2 S. C. Rit. Decr. 9 Februarii, 1762.
3 S. C. Rit. Decr. 3 Augusti, 1839.
4 S. C. Rit. Decr. 11 Iunii, 1880.
5 S. C. Rit. Decr. 29 Martii, 1851.
6 S. C. Rit. Decr. 22 Septembr., 1837.
7 S. C. Rit. Decr. eod.
8 S. C. Rit. Decr. 8 Aprilis, 1865.
9 S. C. Rit. Decr. 23 Maii, 1835.
10 S. C. Rit. Decr. 22 Ianuarii, 1876.

Salutations.

Coram SS. Sacramento publicae venerationi exposito, nemini debetur reverentia.[1]

Reciting the Office.

Clerus, recitans Horas canonicas ante SS. Sacramentum velo coopertum in loco eminenti, poterit sedere, tecto etiam capite cum bireto ; sed laudandus esset, si sederet detecto capite.[2]

S. CONGREGATIO CONCILII.

De abusibus circa Missarum eleemosynas reprimendis.

DECRETUM.

Vigilanti studio convellendis eradicandisque abusibus missarum celebrationem spectantibus jugiter incubuit S. C., pluraque edidit decreta, quibus omne hac in re damnabile lucrum removeri voluit, piasque testantium voluntates et obstrictam benefactoribus fidem ad amussim servari religioseque custodiri mandavit.

Quapropter ad cohibendam pravam quorumdam licentiam qui ad ephemerides, libros, aliasque merces facilius cum clero commutanda missarum ope utebantur, nonnulla constituit, eaque, Pio PP. IX fel. rec. approbante, edi et Ordinariis nota fieri curavit ut ab omnibus servarentur. Propositis namque inter alia sequentibus dubiis :

" I. An turpe mercimonium sapiat, ideoque improbanda et poenis etiam ecclesiasticis, si opus fuerit, coercenda sit ab Episcopis eorum bibliopolarum vel mercatorum agendi ratio, qui adhibitis publicis invitamentis et praemiis, vel alio quocumque modo missarum eleemosynas colligunt, et sacerdotibus, quibus eas celebrandas committunt, non pecuniam, sed libros aliasve merces rependunt?

" II. An haec agendi ratio ideo cohonestari valeat, vel quia, nulla facta imminutione, tot Missae a memoratis collectoribus celebrandae committuntur, quot collectis eleemosynis respondeant, vel quia per eam pauperibus sacerdotibus eleemosynis missarum carentibus subvenitur?

" III. An hujusmodi eleemosynarum collectiones et erogationes

1 S. C. Rit. Decr 31 Augusti, 1793.
2 S. C. Rit. Decr. 10 September, 1796.

tunc etiam improbandae et coercendae, ut supra, sint ab Episcopis, quando lucrum, quod ex mercium cum eleemosynis permutatione hauritur, non in proprium colligentium commodum, sed in piarum institutionum et bonorum operum usum vel incrementum impenditur?

"IV. An turpi mercimonio concurrant, ideoque improbandi atque etiam coercendi, ut supra, sint ii, qui acceptas a fidelibus vel locis piis eleemosynas missarum tradunt bibliopolis, mercatoribus, aliisque earum collectoribus, sive recipiant, sive non recipiant quidquam ab iisdem praemii nomine?

"V. An turpi mercimonio concurrant, ideoque improbandi et coercendi, ut supra, sint ii qui a dictis bibliopolis, et mercatoribus recipiunt pro missis celebrandis libros aliasve merces, harum pretio sive imminuto sive integro?

"VII. An liceat Episcopis sine speciali S. Sedis venia ex eleemosynis missarum, quas fideles celebrioribus Sanctuariis tradere solent, aliquid detrahere, ut eorum decori et ornamento consulatur, quando praesertim ea propriis reditibus careant."

In peculiari conventu anni 1874 S. C. resolvit:

"Ad I. *Affirmative.*

"Ad II. *Negative.*

"Ad III. IV et V. *Affirmative.*

"Ad VII. *Negative, nisi de consensu oblatorum.*"

Sed cum postremis hisce annis constiterit, salutares hujusmodi dispositiones ignorantia aut malitia saepius neglectas fuisse, et abusus hac in re valde lateque invaluisse, Eminentissimi Patres S. C. Tridentini interpretes ac vindices, rebus omnibus in duplici generali conventu mature perpensis, officii sui esse duxerunt, quod pridem decretum erat in memoriam plenamque observantiam denuo apud omnes revocare, et opportuna insuper sanctione munire.

Praesenti itaque decreto statuunt, ut in posterum si quis ex sacerdotali ordine contra enunciata decreta deliquerit, suspensioni a divinis S. Sedi reservatae et ipso facto incurrendae obnoxius sit: clericus autem sacerdotio nondum initiatus eidem suspensioni quoad susceptos ordines similiter subjaceat, et inhabilis praeterea fiat ad superiores ordines recipiendos: laici demum excommunicatione latae sententiae Episcopis reservata obstringantur.

Praeterea cum experientia docuerit, mala quae deplorantur ex eo potissimum originem viresque ducere, quod in quorumdam privatorum manus major missarum numerus congeritur quam justa necessitas exigit, ideo iidem Eminentissimi Patres, inhaerentes dispositionibus a Romanis Pontificibus, ac praesertim ab Urbano VIII

et Innocentio XII in Const. *Nuper . . . Cum saepe contingat,* alias datis sub gravi obedientiae praecepto decernunt ac mandant, ut in posterum omnes in singuli ubique locorum beneficiati et administratores piarum causarum aut utcumque ad missarum onera implenda obligati, sive ecclesiastici sive laici in fine cujuslibet anni missarum onera, quae reliqua sunt, et quibus nondum satisfecerint, propriis Ordinariis tradant juxta modum ab iis definiendum. Ordinarii autem acceptas missarum intentiones cum adnexo stipendio primum distribuent inter sacerdotes sibi subjectos qui eis indigere noverint: alias deinde aut S. Sedi, aut aliis Ordinariis committent, aut etiam, si velint, sacerdotibus aliarum dioeceseon, dummodo sibi noti sint, omnique exceptione majores, et legitima documenta edant inter praefixum congruum tempus quibus de exacta earumdem satisfactione constet.

Denique, revocatis quibuscumque indultis et privilegiis usque nunc concessis quae praesentis decreti dispositionibus utcumque adversentur, S. Congregatio curae et officio singulorum Ordinariorum committit, ut praesens decretum omnibus ecclesiasticis suae jurisdictioni subjectis, aliisque quorum ex praescriptis interest, notum sollicite faciant, ne quis in posterum ignorantiam allegare, aut ab hujus decreti observantia se excusare quomodolibet possit: et insuper ut sive in sacra visitatione sive extra sedulo vigilent, ne abusus hac in re iterum inolescant.

Facta autem de his omnibus relatione Sanctissimo D. N. Leoni PP. XIII per infrascriptum S. Congregationis Praefectum, Sanctitas Sua hoc Eminentissimorum Patrum decretum ratum habuit, confirmavit atque edi mandavit, contrariis quibuscumque minime obstantibus.

Datum Romae, die 25 Maii 1893.

ALOYSIUS *Card.* EP. SABINENSIS *Praef.*

L. SALVATI *Secret.*

CONFERENCES.

THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW undertakes to answer in this Department questions of general, not of merely local or personal, interest. Our readers will understand that there are topics in moral theology which may not be discussed in public print, and also, that it is not our purpose to conduct purely private professional correspondence. We shall, however, accommodate ourselves as far as we prudently can to the numerous wants of the reverend clergy.

THE EDITOR.

PLANCHETTE AND OUIJA.

Qu. What are we to think of the "Ouija" boards?

Resp. Discourage their use among all persons for whose virtue you are concerned. These boards are often used as innocent pastimes and without doing any harm; but they are also, and very frequently, the insidious means of destroying Christian faith and virtue. We need neither ignore nor deny the often strange results of the experiments produced by the aid of these mechanical contrivances.

If the phenomena are, as some believe, the effects of the imagination they are dangerous on that very account, because of the vagaries to which they lead weak natures, by over-exciting that faculty of our mind which affects the nervous system more than any other.

If, on the other hand, the phenomena are the effect of some physical energy, a sort of magnetism drawn from the bodies of the sitters, we must determine their moral influence from the attendant circumstances which they exhibit in each case. These circumstances may give to the experiments a character varying from innocent amusement of children, to the artifice of dangerous suggestion. In the latter case the practice derives its malice from the fact that persons may be led to manifest thoughts without assuming the responsibility

for them which otherwise renders their expression criminal. This danger exists practically in the case of most young persons who would be apt to make use of such amusements.

If, finally, the acts of the Ouija board are under the control of preternatural influences, then their use is positively against the law of God, in the same way as soothsaying, divination, spiritualistic conferences and the like, which come from evil. "Observation convinces me," says a well known and presumably honest, though misguided, exponent of the occult art, "that in a majority of cases Ouija boards, when they move intelligently, do so under the guidance of the thought of one or more of the sitters and not under the spirit influence. But mediumship may be developed through Ouija, so that spirits will guide the board whenever it moves at all."

Thus, whatever view we take of the matter, it is plain that the use of such diversions as Ouija and Planchette should be discountenanced; for whilst an innocent intention may exclude positive sin for the time, it cannot undo the dangerous power of irresponsible suggestion with its consequent temptations, not to speak of deeper and more destructive effects upon the mind, heart and body when wrought upon by nervous excitement.

What we think of the "spirit" influences, which are sometimes assumed to be active in these contrivances, we hope to show on some future occasion in a review of some recent psychological works.

MANIFESTATIONS OF CONSCIENCE.

Qu. How far is the Master of Novices (when not a priest) or the Mistress of Novices, allowed to enter into the cognizance of the soul whom he or she has to direct towards the religious profession?

Resp. Just so far as the Master or Mistress of Novices may be capable of understanding and influencing that soul. That

is to say, the Superior gleans by observation what he can regarding the person whom he is to direct toward religious perfection. The knowledge thus gained he is expected to use for the benefit of the novice, who *is free* to manifest his inner life to the Master of Novices, without having any distinct obligation. It follows that the superior has no right or duty to *exact such manifestation of conscience.*

In a document on this subject published by the S. Congregation of Bishops and Regulars in 1860, we read: "It is not at all customary for the S. Congregation to approve manifestations of conscience to the Superior; but this only is permitted, that the religious, *if they wish*, may make known their defects in the observance of the rules, and their progress in virtue; for, as to other points they are to leave them to the confessor." Analecta Jur. Pontif., May and June, 1860. See also Cotel "The Religious Life," Transl. by Reilly, 1894, pag. 238.

The same principle is inculcated in the more recent decree of the Holy See "De Aperitione Conscientiae," Jan. 1891, in which we read as follows:

"Superiors and Superioresses of whatever rank and eminence, are strictly forbidden to induce their subjects, directly or indirectly, whether by precept, counsel, fear, threats or persuasion, to lay open to them the secrets of their conscience. . . . .

"This does not, however, prevent the religious from manifesting, *of their own accord and freely* their souls to the Superiors for the purpose of obtaining from their prudence the necessary counsel and direction, in order that, amid doubts and anxieties of conscience, they may attain to virtue and make progress in perfection."

THE MOTTO IN THE ESCUTCHEON OF CARDINAL SATOLLI.

Qu. Could you explain the meaning of those four isolated letters, Q. E. I. S., in the coat of arms of His Eminence Cardinal Satolli? I hear the question frequently asked, without any satisfactory answer, and as the escutcheon is likely to play an important part

not only in receptions of the Cardinal, but in the historic records of our day for future times, there ought to be some authentic explanation.

Resp. We are at liberty to state that the letters Q. E. I. S. stand for the beatitude announced by our Lord on the Mount: *Q*ui *E*suriunt *I*ustitiam *S*aturabuntur. (St. Math. v, 6.)

It will be noticed that these words contain a delicate and ingenious allusion to the office and name of the Cardinal. In the capacity of Apostolic Delegate he represents justice and judgment—"Justitiam," which is furthermore illustrated by the *sword* in the left field right below the letters I and S. The S, as we said, stands for "Saturabuntur," that is, "they will be satiated." Now in the Italian language the plural form of the perfect participle "satiated" is *satolli*, whence results the combination of the office of "justice" and "Satolli," which is both symbolical and historical. We may add that, as the expression is put in the form of a divine beatitude, it indicates in the happiest possible manner the name, the office and the blessed results of the activity of our illustrious Delegate.

The figure of the dexter field below the "chief point" refers, we believe, to the family arms of the Cardinal, whilst the above mottoes, with the sword of the sinister field, are his cardinalitial choice.

COLOR OF THE STOLE IN THE BLESSING OF ST. BLASE.

Qu. Permit me to propose a doubt in regard to the color to be used in giving the Blessing of St. Blase.

Some hold that the proper color is *red*, as belonging to the office of martyrs, by which the Saint is honored. Others refer to De Herdt, *Praxis*, Vol. I, n. 152, and to Wapelhorst, *Compendium* n. 311, as authority for using the color of the office of the day, which, this year, happened to be white. Which is correct?

Resp. The color to be used in giving the Blessing of St. Blase is that of the mass of the day. This may be any color except black. This year it happened to be *white*, owing to

the fact that the feast of the Purification was transferred to the third of February on account of Septuagesima Sunday occurring on the second.

The *general* rubric of the Ritual, as to color, for all blessings is: "Stola pro ratione temporis utatur, nisi aliter in Missali notetur."

As to this particular Blessing of St. Blase, the rubric of the Missal reads: "Terminata missa, deposita casula et manipulo, accensis duobus cereis . . dicat: Per intercessionem," &c.

This is plain. The celebrant of the Mass is to take off his chasuble and maniple, keep on the *stole of the mass*, and proceed to give the blessing.

MANNER OF WEARING SEVERAL SCAPULARS.

Qu. What are the regulations in regard to the making of the Five Scapulars?

Should they be made separately, or may they be joined together in the manner of the white and purple stoles commonly used in Baptism?

What material and color should be used for the *string* of the Brown Scapular?

What other regulations are considered essential in the making of the Scapulars?

Resp. The proper making of several Scapulars to be worn together requires attention to the following points defined by the S. Congregation, from whose decrees we cite the pertinent passages.

1. Each Scapular must be complete in itself, *i. e.*, consisting of two square or oblong pieces of cloth (one to hang in front, the other in the back,) joined by two strings.

2. Several Scapulars may be stitched together *at the top*, and all the Scapulars may be joined *by one pair of strings*.

"Variorum scapularium panniculi alii aliis superpositi duobus tantum funiculis assuuntur, ita tamen, *ut singulorum*

Scapularium panniculi dependeant tam a pectore, quam ab humeris." (Decret. auth. n. 423 ad. VI.)

By decree of June 14, 1879, (Gardellini App. V, n. 5783) the S. Congregation refuses to approve Scapulars in which several pieces are sewn together into one, notwithstanding the fact that the images and colors of the different Scapulars are distinctly visible.

P. Beringer, consultor of the S. Congregation, thinks that sewing the Scapulars together at the top, which leaves the pieces still pendent and separate, is not contrary to the spirit of the decrees, the object being to preserve the form and distinctness of the garb worn by the religious orders, which the Scapulars represent.

3. The strings may be of any color, material, thickness or length. The "Instructio" of the Carmelite Order says on this subject :

"Vincula quibus conjunguntur binae sacri habitus partes, cum sacrum Scapulare non constituant . . . . possunt fieri ex lino, serico etc. cujuscumque coloris," etc.

4. If, however, the *red* Scapular of the Passion is among the several Scapulars, the *strings* fastening them all together *must be of red wool*, as is prescribed for that particular Scapular.

5. In sewing the Scapulars together at the top, the red Scapular (with the images of the crucifix and the SS. Hearts of Jesus and Mary) should make one of the outsides.

The other outside Scapular is that of the Holy Trinity (white), showing the red and blue cross. (See Beringer—"Die Ablässe," edit. 1895, pag. 396.)

ON THE VATICAN COUNCIL.

Qu. I am studying in a special manner the Vatican Council, and have (1) the documents published by R. F. Martin ; (2) the VII tome of the *Collectio Lacensis* ; (3 the book of Fr. Granderath on the dogmatical constitutions of the Council ; (4) the theological studies on the constitution of the Council by the Abbé Vacant. I

should like to get a work of an historical and artistical character giving an account of the *external* aspect of the Council. Could you indicate any such work to me ?

Resp. There exists upon this subject, a very interesting and artistically illustrated book. It was published in 1887 by Rothschild (Rue des Sts Pères, Paris.) The author of the work, Mr. Charles Yriarte, is well known by his studies on Italian art. He has published an excellent work on Italian sculpture in the XV century, also admirable studies on Florence and the Medici, on Francisca di Rimini, on the Borgias, etc., all of which gained the attention of the literary and artistic world in Europe.

The book we refer to especially as probably meeting the desires of your correspondent, is entitled "Autour du Concile." It contains an artist's souvenirs and sketches of Rome, and is enhanced by numerous illustrations from the pens of Detaille, Geoffrey Durand, Lix, Bocourt, Wallet, etc., and some aqua fortis engravings after Heilbuth. The author leads you pleasantly through the halls of the Vatican and the chapels of Saint Peter's, presenting you with a sort of resurrection of Rome under Pius IX.

But I must warn your inquirer that Charles Yriarte is not a theologian or even a scholastic philosopher. Indeed he is occasionally guilty of queer errors of judgment when it comes to the discussion of dogmatical or disciplinary questions ; but he is a close observer and quickly snatches for the use of his art the momentary changes of a scene, whether revealed in costume, or gesture, or attitude, or some of those strangely sudden and rare manifestations of human nature which puzzle the ordinary mind by reason of their very evasiveness. His literary style and thought are supplemented by this art which prevents us from becoming absorbed in the recitation of facts.

Whilst the documents which the theologian and historian present to us enact the drama of thought, if we may say so, Yriarte aims rather at impressing us with the brilliant effects, the magnificent externals of the scene in which the important historic actors move. He occupies himself with the sights

and persons that give a picturesque background to the grand act, and we learn much from these rambles through quaint and beautiful bypaths. He leads us along with the procession of the members of the Council, to the rooms where the diplomats meet, to the pontifical chapels, introducing us everywhere to illustrious and memorable personages. He takes us to the halls of the Quirinal, the poetical groves and walks up the Pincian hill where we breathe the atmosphere of 1870. . . . How much Rome has changed since then ; how true has become the strange prophecy of Edmond About, which the author cites in his first chapter !

G. PÉRIES.

IS MILK PERMITTED OUTSIDE OF MEALS IN LENT?

Qu. Does the Lenten precept forbid the use (*per modum potûs*) of "skimmed," "sour" or "butter" milk, when taken outside of meals?

Resp. The Lenten law, in prohibiting *lacticinia*, includes milk as *food*, because of its nutritive qualities and its being derived from animals which are considered flesh-meat. "Par est" says the text of the Decretum Gratiani, "ut nos, qui his diebus a carnibus animalium abstinemus, ab omnibus quoque quae sementinam trahunt originem carnis, jejunemus, *a lacte* videlicet, caseo et ovis." (Decr. p. 1, d. 4, c. 6.) As the law does not distinguish the different kinds or grades of the product which comes under the appellation of *lacticinia*, we must conclude that milk in all its forms is included in the prohibition—except in so far as the *parvitas materiae* would of itself exempt from violation of the law persons who take a small quantity merely to allay violent thirst, or for other good and urgent reasons.

LITANIES PROHIBITED BY THE SACRED CONGREGATION.

It is well understood that there may be certain forms of devotion acceptable to God because of the sincerity and simplicity of the heart whence they proceed, which nevertheless, owing to the peculiarities in form or matter, may not be uni-

versally suitable for public and common prayer. Hence the Church limits her express sanction of forms of public devotion, and prohibits the indiscriminate use, in the liturgy, of any but such prayers as are formulated in the text books of her public functions. The following Decree aims at enforcing the observance of this caution. It may be a rude shock to many who have introduced practices of an excellent character in themselves. But a good practice is not always a wise or a legitimate practice when its effect is measured by the common good to be obtained through a uniform discipline.

DECRETUM.

A Sacra Rituum Congregatione expetitum fuit, utrum Litaniae SS Cordis Jesu, quae per Decretum *Pinerolien*, quod circumfertur, quamvis a Sancta Sede approbatae non fuerint, permissae dicuntur, saltem extra functiones stricte liturgicas, recitari aut cantari possint in Ecclesiis vel Oratoriis publicis.

Eadem vero S. Ritum Congregatio ad relationem infrascripti Secretarii, re mature perpensa, respondendum censuit: —"*Negative, etc; cuilibet Decreto contrario derogatum esse per subsequens Generale Decretum datum die 6 Martii, 1894, quo prohibentur Litaniae quaecunque nisi extent in Breviario aut in recentioribus editionibus Ritualis Romani ab Apostolica Sede approbatis.*" Atque ita servari mandavit. Die 28 Novembris, 1895.

Caj. *Card.* ALOISI MASELLA, *Praef.*

A. TRIPEPI, *S. R C., Secretarius.*

The Decree of March 6, 1894, referred to, answers the question "utrum invocationes ad normam Litaniarum, in honorem Sacrae Familiae, Sacratissimi Cordis Jesu, Mariae Perdolentis, S. Joseph, aliorumque Sanctorum in ecclesiis vel oratoriis publicis recitari possint?" by *Negative* simply. The document bears the above date (March 6, 1894) but was not made public until January 15, 1895. (cf. Revue Nouv. Theol. xxvii, p. 142.)

CELEBRATING MASS WITH ONLY ONE ARM.

Some time ago the following case was brought before the S. Congregation of the Council with a request for dispensation "ab irregularitate defectus corporis."

A priest had received a serious injury in his left hand from the bite of a cat. Mortification set in, and the doctors were

obliged to amputate the lower arm, several inches above the wrist. When the wound had healed the defect of the limb was supplied by an artificial hand, which, being of supple material, created hardly any suspicion that it was not real.

In applying for the privilege of saying Mass, from which, according to the ecclesiastical canons, the defect of the left hand debarred him, the priest brought the testimony of his physicians and two witnesses delegated by his archbishop, to prove that he could perform the sacred act without danger of irreverence to the Blessed Sacrament, and likewise without attracting notable attention to his defect, so as not to create surprise or scandal to the faithful.

The argument of the physicians stated that, although the forearm was partly removed, the articulation of the elbow remained perfect, so that the arm could be managed at will by the petitioner without the aid of the right hand.

The two priests who had been delegated to report upon the ability of the petitioner to perform the act of the Mass, stated that by dint of practice he had gained a certain facility of action which enabled him to observe all the ceremonies without any notable deviation or omission; that the only difficulty observable happened when he arrived at the breaking of the Sacred Host, which he did in the following manner:

"Quum nequiret fractionem perficere super calicem, super patenam faciebat eam; porro potuisset quidem in fractione hostiae aliquod auxilium ei ferre manus artificiosa, detinendo paullulum hostiam, ne ipsa durante fractione super patenam nimis moveretur; quod tamen adjutorium ut modicum ita quoque minus dignum videbatur: atque ob idipsum solam dexteram adhibere maluit sacerdos noster."

As the motive of reverence prompted him not to use the artificial left hand for the breaking of the sacred particle, he made use of a Host in which the lines indicating the break to be made were previously indented. This is a common practice and quite licit. Then, by means of his right hand, gently pressing the Sacred Host to and fro against the paten he gradually separated the parts. When he came to the

"Domine non sum dignus," without attempting to place the Sacred Host in his left hand, he let it remain on the paten, whilst he struck his breast thrice with the right hand, "deinde sola manu dextera unam hostiae partem alteri parti super imposuit, ut Sacramentum sumere posset." Then, instead of immediately cleansing the paten of the particles which might be on it, he carefully purified the corporal, with the paten in his right, holding up the edge of the corporal with the artificial hand. Having gathered all the fragments, he carefully placed the paten on the corporal and then took up and carried the gathered particles with the forefinger and thumb of his right hand into the chalice. He took the Precious Blood without lifting the paten under his chin.

The Archbishop recommended the priest to the good graces of the S. Congregation, but suggested that for the sake of avoiding the danger of irreverence, he be obliged to have some priest or deacon to assist him during the latter part of the Mass.

The S. Congregation answered: Pro gratia dispensationis, *dummodo celebret cum assistentia alterius sacerdotis vel diaconi*, prudenti judicio Emi Archiepiscopi (E. S. C. C. 31 Maii, 1891).

ARE SURPLUS STIPENDS FOR MASSES TO BE TURNED OVER TO THE ORDINARY?

Qu. I have somewhere seen mention of a decree of the S. Congregation which obliges Superiors of religious houses to turn over, at the end of each year, to the Ordinaries of their respective dioceses, the stipends for masses which have not been said up to that time.

Is the decree, if authentic, binding in all cases where stipends for masses unsaid at the end of the year remain in the hands of the Superior?

Resp. In 1893 (May 25), the S. Congregation of the Council published a decree reinforcing the standing censures of the Church against all kinds of direct or indirect traffic in masses. To forestall abuses arising from an accumulation of stipends, even where they had been legitimately obtained,

the S. Congregation added to the previous laws on the subject, certain restrictions, among which occurs the following :[1]

"Omnes et singuli ubique locorum beneficiati et administratores piarum causarum aut utcumque ad missarum onera adimplenda obligati, sive ecclesiastici sive laici, in fine cujuslibet anni missarum onera, quae reliqua sunt, et quibus nondum satisfecerint, propriis Ordinariis tradant juxta modum ab iis definiendum. Ordinarii autem acceptas missarum intentiones cum adnexo stipendio primum distribuent inter sacerdotes sibi subjectos qui eis indigere noverint . . ."

According to the terms of this prescription, which is meant to bind under a grave obligation, the stipends for masses not said by the end of the year are to be given to the Bishop, who is expected to distribute them among the poor priests of his diocese, who may be in need of such assistance.

The Decree makes no distinction between individuals and communities, seculars and religious. So far as it is binding, therefore, it obliges alike all clerics who receive stipends for Masses.

But does it actually mean that a priest is to surrender all the "intentions" for Masses unsaid at the end of the year to the Bishop, thus leaving himself without such number as he can conveniently say, or have said, within a reasonable time? We think not. The decree can hardly be intended to overthrow the established legislation of the Church on this subject. That legislation has always sanctioned the retaining of such a number of "intentions" as may be said "intra praescriptum seu breve tempus." Moreover, the very terms of the decree, by which the object of the S. Congregation is set forth seem to exclude the narrower and more rigorously literal interpretation. The purpose is to prevent that "major missarum numerus congeratur quam justa necessitas exigit;"[2] hence the "justa necessitas" is the true measure of the title, by which a priest retains a certain number of intentions legitimately received.

1 The entire Document will be found in the *Analecta*, p. 264.

2 See the text of the Decree in the *Analecta*, pag. 265.

It is true the S. Congregation wishes the above mentioned decree enforced "revocatis quibuscunque indultis et privilegiis usque nunc concessis;" but then ancient custom, according to which a priest may accept stipends for Masses to be said within a reasonable time (or according to the intention of the person who offers the stipend), is not an "indult" or a "privilege," but a practice resting on permanent principles of natural right and justice.

Moreover, it is well understood that the faithful who offer stipends for Masses frequently desire that the latter be said either in their own parish church, where they may be announced, or by some individual priest, in whose devotion they have special confidence. Catholics are, as a rule, well aware that when the time for the Mass is not specified, it will be said as soon as the priest is free to do so; and they tacitly agree to this arrangement. And to this understanding the S. Congregation has given its express sanction on previous occasions. "Caeterum quamvis onera suscepta infra modicum tempus adimpleri nequeant, si tamen tribuens eleemosynam pro aliarum missarum celebratione id sciat, et consentiat, ut illae tunc demum celebrentur, cum susceptis oneribus satisfactum fuerit, id non prohibetur." (Cf. Gury-Ballerini, Vol. II, Tract. de Euchar. P. II, cap. III, art. III.)

The decree of the S. Congregation is, therefore, of unquestionable application only in cases where a number of stipends have accumulated at the end of the year which cannot be said within reasonable time, according to the tacit or expressed intention of those who made the offering.

It is within the duties of the Episcopal visitation to ascertain the facts, and dispose of the surplus intentions according to the prescriptions of the S. Congregation. For a full discussion of this subject consult the *Nouvelle Revue Theologique*, tom XXV, 1893, pag. 354-364.

THE RECENT DECISION OF THE S. CONGREGATION "DE ABORTU MEDICALI."

In view of the recent decision of the S. Congregation "De Abortu Medicali" (the text of which we published with a brief reference in the last number of the REVIEW), the grave question has arisen how far its restrictions practically extend.

Does it cover (as prohibiting) operations "procurantes abortum," which if omitted are sure to leave both mother and child to die, while if performed will as a rule save the life of the mother and give a fair opportunity to the child to be baptized, although it cannot continue to live.

We are constrained to discuss the question with the least possible show of scholastic embarrassment, because it is a vital matter with every conscientious physician and because there are theologians who claim that the case submitted for decision to the S. Congregation proves that the direct procuring of the abortus is under all circumstances illicit.

There are reasons for everything, good or bad; some are founded on the nature of things and some on circumstances. As circumstances are variable, it becomes the duty of the moral theologian to apply fundamental principles with due regard to the changes, and not to assume that a traditional rule of action, because it emanates from reputable theologians will retain its virtue irrespective of the subject to which it is applied.

Let us take the case which embodies the problem in its most critical phases, and which according to the testimony of experienced physicians occurs not unfrequently.

A mother, owing to certain deformities or obstructions of

1 According to an interpretation of the recent decree, given in the January number of *La Ciudad di Dios* (Madrid), physicians are henceforth prevented from performing operations or giving medicines which tend *per se* "ad ejectionem foetûs," even though there is hope that the child may be born alive and receive baptism. At the same time the writer in *La Ciudad* admits that these were circumstances which appeared to render such practice heretofore licit, and hence he holds physicians who formerly used this method of saving life, excusable--but believes that they are so no longer.

organism, is unable to give birth in the normal way. The diagnosis of the doctor reveals that if nature is allowed to have its course, both mother and child will die in the effort of birth, whether this occur prematurely or not.

There is one way of saving the mother's life, and that is by means of an operation which anticipates natural birth at a time when the foetus is still living—and under ordinary circumstances may receive baptism, although it is not yet viable, *i. e.*, it cannot continue to live when exposed.

Can the conscientious physician, having assured himself that the time of deciding between two alternatives has come, perform an operation or take the direct means of procuring an abortus, so as to save the temporal life of the mother, with the probability of his being able also to baptize the unborn child?—whereas otherwise both mother and child are doomed to die.

We feel no doubt on the subject. What the Church as interpreter of the divine law forbids is the killing of a child, however imperfectly formed, even when by this act the mother's life can be saved; for the physician is indeed a preserver of life as an instrument in God's hand, but he is not master of any life and therefore cannot take it, no matter what the consequence.

But in the given case there is no question of killing (directa occisio) such as the terms of the S. Congregation express or imply. The death of the child is indeed accelerated by an inconsiderable time, because it is not viable at the period when we assume the operation must be performed. But are there not countless persons, who shorten their lives for the sake of a legitimate or higher gain. The laborers in the lead-mines, the missionary in the fever penetrated districts of West Africa, or the leper-nurses of Molokai, in various ways sacrifice some part of their lives for the needs of this or the hope a better existence. It is not their principal purpose, nor their purpose at all, but they do it, and do it legitimately. And the superiors who employ the workers in the hospitals, or who send their subjects to the dangerous missions are not to be blamed for counseling and assisting in this self-sacrifice,

which is foreseen and may be even desired for the gain attached to its accomplishment.

Such is the position of the doctor, who saving the mother's life affords at the same time an opportunity to the child of being baptized. This object, we are assured, is kept in view even by those physicians who, although not Catholics, have received their education in our better medical schools, such as at the University of Pennsylvania, where the professors have for many years shown great conservatism and inculcated as a first principle of medical ethics respect for the religious feelings and desires of the patient.

But is this view excluded by the recent decision of the S. Congregation, which is accompanied by a practical case illustrating the bearing of the ecclesiastical prohibition?

Let us see. In the case presented to the S. Congregation we have the *mother* threatened with sure death unless her child is removed *before it is viable.* The infant too is likely to live long enough after the operation, so as to receive baptism—but, we are constrained to ask, *might it not have lived, and been baptized, and grown to maturity if the operation had not been performed?* This we are not told; but it makes a very decided difference. In the case which we submitted above *both mother and child are sure to die* if nature is allowed to take her course. In the case submitted to the S. Congregation, the mother is sure to die if nature is allowed to take her course, but the child may be born and live, and be useful according to the designs of God. To force the premature birth of this child at a time when it is not yet viable (that is when it can not continue to live after being exposed), is to kill it—and this is not within the right of any physician to do, even if he can save thereby the life of a mother.

Assuming then the case in which, if the full period of gestation be allowed to pass, the child would be born and live, perhaps for years, though the mother must surely die—the doctor who operates for the "procuratio abortûs" is taking the life of the child, and that directly, although his intention or preference may be merely to save the mother. The law "thou shalt not kill" admits of no mitigation except

in case of unjust aggression or absolute necessity. But the child is not an unjust aggressor, nor has the doctor the duty or the right of taking its life in order to restore his patient.

The case which we proposed at the beginning is wholly different in this respect. It is a question of saving two lives, one temporal, the other eternal, both of which are declared forfeited unless the doctor enterfere.

THE PLENARY INDULGENCE "IN ARTICULO MORTIS."

Qu. Called to administer the last Sacraments recently to a prominent member of the parish, I noticed over his bed a framed copy of the Plenary Indulgence for the hour of death, given to him and his family personally by Pope Pius IX. I thought it needless, therefore, to give the ordinary indulgence "pro articulo mortis" found in our missionary faculties.

Later on it occurred to me that I should have disposed the dying man for obtaining the indulgence by inducing him to comply with the usual conditions prescribed, namely: 1. To accept with resignation the death which awaits him; 2. To pronounce with contrite heart the holy name of *Jesus*. Although these requisites, were not mentioned in the pontifical document, am I right in assuming that they are always to be understood as *conditiones sine qua non* for gaining the Plenary Indulgence "in articulo mortis?"

Resp. The Indulgence "pro articulo mortis" granted directly by the Pontiff requires, by common interpretation, (See Melata, *De Bened. Papali*, p. 193.) nothing more than the at least virtual desire to gain it, and that disposition of sorrow for sin, which is always demanded for obtaining an Indulgence. We assume, of course, that the pontifical privilege, whether written or verbal, does not expressly mention any other conditions.

As to the Indulgence "in articulo mortis" granted by special faculty to missionary priests and others (Ex concess. Bened. XIV et Clement XIV.) it requires as a *conditio sine qua non* the invocation (at least mentally) of the holy name

of *Jesus*. This has been declared by the S. Congregation (Decr. 23 Sept. 1775; and again on 22 Sept. 1892, in answer to a question proposed by the Archbishop of Dublin).

It is clear that the difference in the manner in which the Indulgence is communicated to the dying person in the two given cases implies a difference in the conditions to be performed.

We take this opportunity to advert to the case in which the dying person is altogether incapable of invoking the holy name, for example, in cases of unconsciousness, or delirium, or inability of any kind to comprehend? Does such a person gain the Indulgence?

Presumably, yes; inasmuch as the Church dispenses in such cases from the obligation otherwise imposed. That she does so actually appears from the rubric of the Ritual, which enjoins that the Apostolic Benediction be given, not only to the dying who have the use of their senses, but also to such as are destitute of consciousness, or out of their mind, provided the priest can reasonably presume that they desired such a blessing when in the full possession of their mental faculties. (See Rituale Rom. Tit. V, cap. 6.)

Such a provision would be useless if it were understood that the Indulgence could not be gained in the given cases. Hence it is clear that the Church means to dispense from the otherwise requisite condition.

BOOK REVIEW.

ROMAN LIFE IN LATIN PROSE AND VERSE. Illustrative Readings from Latin Literature, Selected and Edited by Harry T. Peck, Ph. D., and Robert Arrowsmith, Ph. D. American Book Co. New York. Pp. 256. Pr. $1.50.

We have here a work that will go far to supply a want in the average college curriculum. Ordinarily the course of study in the Latin Humanities is based on Cæsar and Cicero, Virgil and Horace, with a few other authors of prose and verse. The student is thus apt to acquire some familiarity with the greater classics, with their general thought and style, but he gains little acquaintance with the development of Latin literature, and perhaps still less with the everyday language of the ancient Romans. A work, therefore, which shall present a general survey of the history of Latin letters, illustrated by typical extracts, and exhibiting somewhat of the living speech of the old Romans, cannot but be a desirable adjunct to our college text books. Such a work is the one here under review.

Its authors have gleaned from many fields, and have gathered not of course all the best, but much, very much, that is excellent, and have directed their readers to still ampler harvests. The student may here learn how the Roman mother sang the little one to sleep, and how the little one in turn sang and prattled when awake; how the farmer gauged the weather, and how the lover serenaded his lady; what charm cured a sprain, and what a footache; how a ball game was advertised and an election-appeal put forth; what Quintilian thought of whipping the small school boy; some jokes at which the Romans are supposed to have laughed, and many of the old saws and maxims in which they chrystalized their practical wisdom.

The representative Latin writers are taken up chronologically, a biographical sketch is given of each, and some typical extracts pre-

sented. These extracts are not fragments torn off from the text, but each has a certain completeness, and embodies some literary gems.

This feature extends the usefulness of the work beyond the school room, and adapts it to the tastes of the general reader as well as to the service of the literateur.

Lastly, the material setting of the book is worthy of its contents. Binding, letter-press, illustration are such as to make one desirous of reliving his college days if only for the joy and the advantage of studying his classics through such beautiful media.

F. P. S.

A TUSCAN MAGDALEN, and other Legends and Poems. By Eleanor C. Donnelly, Philadelphia: H. L. Kilner & Co.

Poetry has been called, as it really is, the essence of art. Art is the expression (sensible) of the beautiful; and the beautiful is the splendor of truth. Hence it follows that the highest results of poetic genius may be reached by those who habitually dwell in, as they love, the domain of truth. On the other hand there is no medium that can more aptly convey truth in its profoundest and most subtle aspects than art, and poetry in particular. It combines that strange virtue which demonstrates and reveals, which convinces and by some mysterious influence renders the conviction a prominent and living motive of action. Hence the study, the cultivation of poetry is in reality a much more important factor in the education of both mind and heart than we ordinarily take it to be. For this reason, if for no other, we should make much of our poets. They should be listened to whilst we have them about us, rather than read when they are dead; for it is a fact that an attentive audience hightens the powers of real genius, and thus appreciation becomes productive anew of that which is highest within the reach of an artist.

Miss Donnelly's poems are the products of a truly poetic soul. They inspire because they are inspired by affection for what is pure and holy. There is a hallowed peace about the scenes which she creates about us of

> Prophets and patriarchs, saints, heroes, sages,
> And virgins chaste as snow,

who teach us lessons of life—life truest, because it deals not with the phantom ladder of vanities, but with the rock-hewn way that leads

to our eternal home. The rythm of her verse is simple, and the sounds of the words sweetly catch each other like children at innocent play. Sometimes you fancy to hear echoes from readings of "Evangeline," but the thought that there could be anything borrowed never comes to you, and you repeat, without growing weary, the same lines, and muse over the same fair thoughts until they sink deep into the heart.

We recommend this volume, as all Miss Donnelly's writings, because she is a sterling Catholic and a gifted poet, both qualities making her an apt teacher of what can only tend to ennoble and what must always please those who aim at truth through the beautiful.

LIFE OF CARDINAL MANNING, Archbishop of Westminster. By Edmund Sheridan Purcell. In two volumes. Vol. I, Manning as an Anglican. Vol. II, Manning as a Catholic.—New York and London: Macmillan & Co. 1896.

Perhaps the less said about this "Life" of the great Archbishop of Westminster, the better. It is an elaborate but altogether distorted portrait, not because Mr. Purcell wished to wrong the Cardinal, but because he attempted to rear a monument with ill-matched and insufficient material. He is guilty of serious, if not criminal, indiscretion in publishing from the private letters to which he had been allowed access, such as concern the affairs of persons who entrusted their private and personal difficulties to the Cardinal as a discreet guide, and whom Mr. Purcell had no right to drag into the public. As he did not have all the letters and diaries of the man whom he depicts, he is led to place in prominence certain clues to Manning's character which, interpreted without the light of attendant circumstances and of the principal motives of his life, cast an unbecoming shadow upon the noble form. It is as if one painted a portrait of a typical hero in the act of performing his morning ablution. The form of the man is there, but it gives us no idea of the true figure or of the characteristic qualities which render him admirable as he was. A biography which fails to do this fails in its main purpose.

We advise all admirers of the great Cardinal, and indeed all impartial students of the history of which Manning is an integral part, to wait for the *complete* "Life" which is promised to appear at an early date from more judicious and competent hands.